



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

## AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

HELD AT ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, SEPTEMBER, 1904

ALSO OF THE FIFTH AND SIXTH ANNUAL MEETINGS OF THE

## Philological Association of the Pacific Coast

HELD AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DECEMBER, 1903

AND

DECEMBER, 1904

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH  
ANNUAL MEETING (ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI).

Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.  
R. Arrowsmith, New York, N. Y.  
Sidney G. Ashmore, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y.  
Francis M. Austin, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill.  
C. P. Bill, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.  
M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
George M. Bolling, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.  
George Willis Botsford, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.  
Demarchus C. Brown, Butler College, Irvington, Ind.  
Carl D. Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
Charles Nelson Cole, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.  
Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
Herman L. Ebeling, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.  
William S. Ebersole, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia.  
Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.  
Herbert B. Foster, University of South Dakota, Vermilion, S. D.  
Frank H. Fowler, Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill.  
George Depue Hadzsits, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.  
Walter David Depue Hadzsits, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.  
William Gardner Hale, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
F. A. Hall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.  
Karl P. Harrington, University of Maine, Orono, Me.  
J. E. Harry, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.  
W. A. Heidel, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.  
George Hempl, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
Walter Hullihen, Grant University, Chattanooga, Tenn.  
J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.  
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York, N. Y.  
F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
Walter Miller, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.  
Frank G. Moore, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.  
Daniel A. Penick, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.  
Edward D. Perry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.  
John Pickard, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
Rufus B. Richardson, New York, N. Y.  
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.  
J. J. Schlicher, State Normal School, Terre Haute, Ind.

John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
T. D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.  
F. W. Shipley, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.  
Paul Shorey, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
M. S. Slaughter, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.  
Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Arthur T. Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.  
Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.  
Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.  
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

[Total, 48.]

# AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

ST. LOUIS, MO., September 16, 1904.

The Thirty-sixth Annual Meeting was called to order at 3.10 P.M. in a recitation-room in the new buildings of Washington University, by the President, Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan.

The Secretary of the Association, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth, of Harvard University, read the following list of persons who had been nominated for membership in the Association. At a later meeting they were declared elected by the Executive Committee :

Prof. George Henry Allen, University of Cincinnati.  
Edmund C. Cook, Esq., New York, N. Y.  
Prof. Eli Dunkle, Ohio University, Athens, O.  
Miss Susan Fowler, Columbia University.  
Prof. George D. Hadzsits, University of Cincinnati.  
Dr. Walter D. D. Hadzsits, Smith College.  
Prof. Archer Wilmot Hendrick, Whitman College.  
Adam Fremont Hendrix, Esq., University of Kansas.  
Prof. Walter Hüllihen, Grant University, Chattanooga, Tenn.  
Dr. Samuel A. Jeffers, State Normal School, California, Pa.  
Dr. Elizabeth Mary Perkins, Washington, D. C.  
G. E. Scoggin, Esq., Cambridge, Mass.  
Dr. Andrew Shedd, University of Florida.  
Eric Arthur Starbuck, Esq., Worcester, Mass.  
Prof. William F. Swahlen, De Pauw University.  
Prof. Frank Vogel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.  
Dr. Arletta L. Warren, State Normal School, Madison, S. D.

The Secretary also reported that the annual volume had been published in April, and that the Bibliographical Record was still incomplete at the time of this meeting.

Professor Smyth then presented his report as Treasurer for the year 1903-1904 :—

## RECEIPTS.

Balance from 1902-1903 . . . . .	\$658.65
Sales of Transactions . . . . .	\$139.46
Membership dues . . . . .	1401.00
Initiation fees . . . . .	90.00
Dividends Central New England and Western R. R. . . . .	6.00
Offprints . . . . .	6.00
Interest . . . . .	8.00
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast . . . . .	214.97
Total receipts for the year . . . . .	1865.43
	<hr/>
	\$2524.08

## EXPENDITURES.

Transactions and Proceedings (Vol. XXXIV) . . . . .	\$1074.43
Salary of Secretary . . . . .	300.00
Postage . . . . .	33.93
Printing . . . . .	16.00
Expressage . . . . .	3.78
Incidentals . . . . .	7.83
Total expenditures for the year . . . . .	\$1435.97
Balance, July 6, 1903. . . . .	1088.11
	<hr/>
	\$2524.08

It was further reported that the Executive Committee had voted to continue for three years more its annual contribution of £40 towards the expense of preparing the Platonic Lexicon under the direction of Professor Lewis Campbell.

The reading of papers was then begun.

# 1. A Misinterpreted Greek Optative, by Professor J. E. Harry, of the University of Cincinnati.

The one hundred and eighty-sixth verse of the *Ajax* of Sophocles (ἦκοι γὰρ ἄν θέα νόσος) has been frequently misinterpreted. Jebb translates: "When heaven sends madness, it must come." This is incorrect; ἦκοι ἄν is not equivalent to ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν, ἀνάγκη ἀφικέσθαι. A proper conception of the tenor of the whole passage depends upon a correct understanding of ἦκοι ἄν. The Greek optative varies in significance from "may" to "must"; sometimes means "can" and "will." Cf. Soph. *Phil.* 1302, οὐκ ἄν μελῆην; Eur. *Heracl.* 344, οὐκ ἄν λίποιμι βωμόν; *I.A.* 310, οὐκ ἄν μελείμην; *Ion*, 418, στείχοιμ' ἄν εἰσω; Aesch. *Cho.* 1050, 1062, οὐκέτ' ἄν μείναιμι ἐγώ. It may be "permissive," or "jussive," e.g. λέγοις ἄν, εἰ τι τῶνδ' ἔχεις ὑπέρτερον (Aesch. *Cho.* 105), to which the chorus replies, αἰδουμένη σοι βωμόν ὥς τύμβον πατρός | λέξω, κελεύεις γάρ. The polite request (veuillez parler) is answered by λέξω. Cf. *Eum.* 94, εὐδοιτ' ἄν; 117, μύζοιτ' ἄν; Soph. *Phil.* 674, *El.* 1491, χωροῖς ἄν εἰσω; *Ant.* 1339, ἀγοιτ' ἄν. But

when Meno speaks to his slave he says *δεῦρο προσελθε* (82 A). The modals in the dialogue between Isabella and Angelo in *Measure for Measure* are the despair of the foreigner. But "must" is particularly difficult for the novice. Our "must have" is reserved to express an idea which is generally rendered in modern European languages by the future perfect indicative: "Il lettore sarà certamente meravigliato" (Fanfani, *Cecco d'Ascoli*, ch. 45). Cf. George Sand, *Lélia*, ch. 64: "Ils auront voulu pêcher les truites du lac; le plus hardi des deux se sera risqué trop avant; il aura crié au secours, mais l'autre aura eu peur et la force lui aura manqué." In like manner the Salaminian sailors have come to the conclusion that their chieftain lies stricken by frenzy sent from heaven. The perfect optative middle and passive (with *ἄν*) must have been a favorite method with the Greeks, of expressing subjective conviction with reference to the past. But the verb which would have been naturally most employed happens to be without a perfect, hence was unable to form an optative with *ἄν* in the perfect to express the idea which is usually rendered in modern European languages by a future perfect (*wird gewesen sein, aura été, sarà stato, habrá sido*). Hence the Greek was content to use the present for the perfect: Herodotus I, 2, *εἴησαν δ' ἄν οὗτοι Κρήτες, these must have been Cretans*. The pure perfect optative active in any verb is exceedingly rare. In Xen. *An.* 5, 7, 26, is found one of the few examples without *ἄν* (*ἔδεισαν δὲ μὴ λύττα τις ὥσπερ κυσὶν ἡμῖν ἐμπεπτώκοι*). This sentence almost paraphrases the passage in the *Ajax*. The mariners, who constitute the chorus, fear that madness has seized their leader. But the optative in this sentence is doubly disguised, is really a perfect masquerading as a present and a passive as an active (*ventum sit*). The chorus means: *ἀφίγμένη ἄν εἴη θεία νόσος*. If we read on a hundred verses we get all the light we need from the mariners themselves. In responding to Tecmessa in 278 f., they repeat what they say here—only the sentence is given a different cast, *δέδοικα μὴ 'κ θεοῦ | πλῆγὴ τις ἦκη*. If verse 186 had been correctly interpreted by the commentators, there would have been no controversy as to the correct reading in 279 (*ἦκει or ἦκη*). Mekler reads the indicative, Jebb the subjunctive. Cp. Soph. *O.T.* 1011, *ταρβῶν γε μὴ μοι Φοῖβος ἐξέλθῃ σαφής*; 1182, *τὰ πάντ' ἄν ἐξήκοι σαφῆ*. Even Tecmessa sees in Ajax's behavior evidence of a *διαφθορὰ φρενῶν*, a *θεία νόσος* (243). It is the subjective conviction of the chorus that a *θεοβλάβεια or νόσος φρενῶν* has visited their chief. Consequently, *ἦκοι ἄν θεία νόσος* is equivalent to *θεία νόσος αὐτῷ ἐμπεπτωκυῖα ἄν εἴη, er wird von einem Gott getroffen sein, quelque dieu l'aura atteint de folie, la pazzia gli sarà venuta dal cielo*.

This paper is published in full in the *Classical Review*, April, 1905.

## 2. Horace as a Nature Poet, by Professor Karl P. Harrington, of the University of Maine.

If, judged on grounds of antecedent probability and environment, Tibullus and Propertius, as we have previously shown, exhibit but a disappointing amount of appreciation of nature in its simplicity and its most palpable relations, and it is evident that nature exerted but a meagre influence on the subject-matter, the illustrations, or the general tone of their writings, our surprise is rather in the

opposite direction, as we discover that Horace, the most carefully polished, the most laboriously concise, the most artfully naïve of all Roman poets, who taught Rome to appreciate Greek models of lyric verse in abounding variety, who could lay away his unfinished beginnings for an indefinite period till the best *callida iunctura* should be worked out, who could carve out a poem on any subject, from Lalage's rippling laughter to the analysis of those qualities that should inhere in the ideal Roman citizenship,—that this Horace is so permeated with affection for, and appreciation of, the simple beauty of the fields and flocks, the groves, the babbling brooks, the wind in the tree-tops, and the moon-lit heavens, that we can ever see the humble rustic lad from the back-country village of Venusia, underneath all the external niceties of Roman society in the metropolis, and amid the folly and frippery of the Augustan court.

For it is mostly the pictures that Horace knew when a boy in Apulia, or those other ones which he loved so well among the Sabine mountains, which he presents to us in his poetry, with more or less directness and definiteness. Not that Horace omits the conventional references to Erymanthus and Tempe, to the Cyclades, and to the dust of Troy, to Proteus lording it over his seals, and to Enceladus prone beneath the roaring fires of Aetna. But, to our infinite satisfaction, he prefers to draw his parallels, and no small amount of his inspiration, from the dearest scenes of his childhood, or from those amid which his ripening years were so well at ease.

Even if we admit that sometimes he poses a little for effect, we cannot doubt that he is a true lover of the country. His picture of the delights that Alfius enjoyed in the country are really but a snapshot of himself upon his Sabine estate.

It must have been on that poor little Venusian farm of his father's that Horace had grown so close to nature. When in childhood he wandered off on the slopes of the Mons Voltur, the experience left only a fond reminiscent longing (*Carm.* iii. 4, 6–24). We may well believe it is this same dominating height which he has in mind when speaking of the life of the hills, or of the streams that sweep down so suddenly from their slopes, as in *Carm.* i. 23, 1–8; 15, 29–32; iv. 2, 5–6.

The stream that naturally impressed Horace most in his boyhood days was the Aufidus. To this he refers again and again, either by name or by implication; so in *Serm.* i. 1, 58, *et passim*; *Carm.* iv. 14, 25–28. And even the simile in *Carm.* iii. 29, 33–41 probably includes *Etruscum* for merely conventional considerations of politeness towards Maecenas, while really picturing the stream that Horace knew best. Peace and gladness at other times and places are suggested by the same river. It is still the Aufidus that we may see in such a passage as *Carm.* ii. 5, 5–9. Similar scenes of rustic life are found in *Carm.* iii. 11, 9–10; iv. 2, 27–31, where perhaps both the Calabrian and the Sabine country are really in the mind of the poet.

Something, too, of wild life Horace surely knew in his early days, as we may judge from *Carm.* iii. 12, 10–12. Nor did he forget the fierce storms of southern Italy (*Carm.* i. 28, 25–27). And though he was no sailor, he knew by experience something of the dangers off the eastern horizon of his boyhood home, as is indicated, *e.g.*, by *Carm.* iii. 27, 17–24; i. 33, 15–16. To Apulia also it seems natural to refer such other scenes as are described in *Carm.* iii. 27, 5–7, 9–12, and elsewhere.

Once, however, away for all time from his childhood surroundings, he turns



for rural joys to the Sabine mountains near Rome, where so many of his new associates could afford summer homes. Beautiful Tibur especially inspires him, as in *Carm.* i. 7, 10-17; iv. 3, 10-11; i. 18, 1-2; ii. 6, 5-8.

But when Horace was at length possessed of his darling estate on the slopes of the valley of the Digentia, all other spots on earth were to him of secondary beauty and importance. Here he was supremely content, as poem after poem clearly shows, e.g. *Carm.* i. 17; ii. 18, 11-16; iii. 18; 16, 29-32. Here is most probably to be located the Bandusian spring (*Carm.* iii. 13); and here from time to time he describes his life in communion with the rustic world about him (*Carm.* iv. 5, 29-30; 12, 3-12; 7, 1-4; iii. 1, 29-32).

More minute analysis of his preferences in describing nature phenomena shows unusual interest in the sea and the winds, less appreciation of day and night. Fire, the stars, rain, and the seasons have impressed him less than we should have expected.

3. On the Distinction between *Comitia* and *Concilium*, by Dr. George Willis Botsford, of Columbia University.

This paper appears in the TRANSACTIONS.

4. Notes on Ovid, by Dr. Edward Kennard Rand, of Harvard University (read by Professor Frank G. Moore).

This paper also will be found in the TRANSACTIONS.

5. A Critical Note on Catullus, *Carm.* lxxviii, 93, by Professor F. W. Shipley, of Washington University, St. Louis.

Of the numerous difficulties which the text of Catullus still presents, none is more baffling than the corruption in lxxviii, 93: *Quae uetet id*. The whole context is as follows:—

90                   Nam tum Helenae raptu primores Argivorum  
                    Cooperat ad sese Troia ciere uiros,  
                    Troia (nefas) commune sepulchrum Asiae Europaeque,  
                    Troia uirum et uirtutum omnium acerba cinis,  
                    *Quae uetet id* nostro letum miserabile fratri  
                    Attulit. Ei misero frater adempte mihi,  
95                   Ei misero fratri iucundum lumen ademptum,  
                    Tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus,  
                    Omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra  
                    *Quae tuus* in uita dulcis alebat amor.

The unintelligible *Quae uetet id* is substantially the reading of all the manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> Many emendations have been offered by scholars. I quote from Ellis: "nuper *Passeratius* nunc et *Marcilius Ungerus* uitai nostrae *Ribbeckius* in

<sup>1</sup> The app. crit. of the edition of Ellis gives the readings as follows: *Quae uetet id* A C D G H L La<sup>2</sup> O V *Quae uectet id* B La<sup>1</sup>, *sed in B ultima littera uocabuli uectet ita producta est, ut uecter esse potuerit.* *Quae uetat id a d.* *Quae uetet b P.*

*Jahn. Ann.* lxxxv, 378 uelut id *Coningto* uelut his uel eis *Eduinus Palmer* (Queis ueluti id iam antea *Froelichius*) ueterum id *Heysius* ueter id *ed. Parm.* 1473, quod in *ed. I retinui* Quaene etiam *Heinsius G. Hermannus in Jahn. Ann.* xxxiii, 245." Ellis, after retaining in his first edition the *Quae ueter id* of the *ed. Parm.* 1473, has, in his second edition, adopted an emendation of his own, *Qualiter id*. He cites, in support of the use of the somewhat rare word *Qualiter*, its occurrence in *Ov. Am.* 1. 7. 58, *Martial*, and *Valerius Flaccus*.

While I can agree with Ellis in rejecting the other conjectures, I cannot feel that his own emendation is at all satisfying, even if it does involve but a slight change in the text from *Quae ueter id* of B. After all, the examples which he cites of the use of *qualiter* simply help to confirm the rarity of the word. It is not found elsewhere in *Catullus*, or indeed in any writer until *Ovid*. But, aside from the rarity of *qualiter*, and the fact that it does not occur elsewhere in *Catullus*, and granting for the moment that *as* is the sense needed, there is still a difficulty in *id*. Whether it is used in the sense of *idem* or in that of *illud*, its force in either case is much weaker than that of either word. It could, in fact, be omitted altogether without serious loss of emphasis. So far as the *id* is concerned, it results in producing a weak line, where a strong one is evidently intended.

To return now to *Qualiter*. The passage in which *Catullus* speaks of his brother's death is no mere incidental comparison, such as would be introduced by this word. It contains the strongest vein of lyric feeling in a poem otherwise constructed in a somewhat mechanical way upon an Alexandrian plan. The exclamation *nefas* is evoked, not so much by the thought of the Trojan war, as by the sense of his own bereavement which the name of Troy calls back to his mind. The same is also true of the words *acerba cinis*. *Acerba* has the double sense of "bitter" and "untimely," and is much more pregnant with meaning in connection with the death of his brother than it would be if it applied merely to the legendary heroes of Troy whose promising careers were cut short. The bitterness of his brother's untimely end is again the keynote of his plaint in *Carm. ci*, *Heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi*. The two expressions, *nefas* and *acerba cinis*, form then the point of departure from the conventionally treated story of *Protesilaus* and *Laodamia* to the deeper personal feelings of the poet in the clause which follows containing the corruption. The clause should therefore present, not a mere incidental comparison, such as *Qualiter* might introduce, but a reason for the intensity of the feeling expressed in *nefas* and *acerba cinis*: "Troy—a curse upon her—the common burial ground of Europe and of Asia, of brave men and brave deeds untimely grave, since she has brought sorrowful death even to my own brother, alas my brother!" etc.

It is with diffidence that I attempt to add to the list of suggested emendations, already abnormally large. I believe, however, that the emendation which I propose: *Quandoquidem et*, which makes the lines read, *Quandoquidem et nostro letum miserabile fratri | attulit. Ei misero frater adempte mihi*, has much to recommend it, not only in giving the necessary force to the line, but also in accounting for the corruption.

*Nostro* is clearly the emphatic word in the line—my own brother—and needs an *et* or some other word with the sense of "even" to bring this emphasis out. *Quandoquidem* gives the reason for the expression of feeling in *nefas*, "a

curse upon her," and *acerba cinis*, "untimely grave." *Quandoquidem* is a word in frequent use by Lucretius in this position in a hexameter line, and is not only used by Catullus himself in this way, but is actually used in another passage (*Carm.* ci, 5) which also treats of his brother's death. The passage in question contains, in addition to similarity of sentiment, a repetition of several words which occur in the couplet lxviii, ll. 93-4: *Quae uetet id* nostro letum miserabile fratri | attulit. Ei misero frater adempte mihi. The passage in *Carm.* ci reads as follows:—

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora uectus  
Advenio has miseras, frater, ad inferias,  
Ut te postremo donarem munere mortis  
Et mutam nequicquam alloquerer cinerem,  
5 *Quandoquidem fortuna mihi te abstulit ipsum,*  
*Heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi.*  
Nunc tamen interea, etc.

Comparing now the couplets lxviii, 93-4, and ci, 5-6, it will be seen that the second half of the one couplet is almost identical with that of the other. It would, therefore, not be surprising if the first word of the couplet ci, 5-6, echoed unconsciously the first word in the couplet lxviii, 93-4. When *Quandoquidem et* occurred to me as the probable reading for *Quae uetet id*, I had not thought of the presence of *Quandoquidem* in the corresponding passage in *Carm.* ci. Its presence there came, accordingly, as a fairly strong piece of corroborative evidence.

There still remains the task of explaining how *Quandoquidem et* can be deduced from the manuscript reading *Quae uetet id*, or *Quae uetet id* from *Quandoquidem et*. To begin with, it is no ordinary corruption which has caused scholars for centuries to puzzle over four syllables in a passage in which the sense is as clear as it is here. I believe that the corruption, which was already in the lost Verona manuscript, began with the abbreviated forms of *quando* and *quidem*, e.g. qñ qñ. The passage may have been written in some such way as qñ qñet. Out of the first letter of the abbreviation of *quando* the *quae* might easily have grown, and out of the *quidem et*, with a partial abbreviation of the former, may have arisen a corruption which contained as an intelligible residuum *id et*. I believe that some scribe or corrector, attempting to make sense of the passage, now corrupt, suggested as a variant *et id*, thus: *uel et id*; and that out of this variant grew the reading *uetet id*, the remainder of the corruption.

## SECOND SESSION.

Friday evening, September 16.

The Association met in the hall of the Library at 8 P.M. to hear the address of the President.

6. America and the English Language, by Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan.

This address will appear elsewhere, and the author has preferred to omit the customary abstract in this place.

## THIRD SESSION.

Saturday morning, September 17.

The Association convened at 10.15 A.M., and proceeded at once to the reading of papers.

7. Accent and Ictus in Late Latin Hexameters, by Professor Frank G. Moore, of Dartmouth College.

The discussion was limited to the last two feet of the hexameter, with special attention to the admission of pyrrhic words in the fifth foot. It was shown that the general statement of an agreement between word-accent and verse-ictus in the *clausula* of the verse<sup>1</sup> is subject to considerable modification, in view of the wide differences of practice among the later Latin poets, especially in the treatment of pyrrhic words in the fifth foot. For while one poet will admit such unaccented words only where they are excused by some form of enclisis, another goes any length in accepting the pyrrhic word, even though emphasis makes it difficult to dispense with accent, — and that with such frequency as to strain even the most elastic theory of enclisis or proclisis. In the former case there is an evident effort to secure coincidence of ictus with *phrase*-accent, — a more important kind of stress, it was argued, than *word*-accent. On the other hand, in the second case one must feel that the poet in question allowed any pyrrhic word, being indifferent to the loss of accent in a single word, so long as the general movement of the *clausula* was maintained.

The poets examined ranged from the end of the third century to the beginning of the sixth, *i.e.*, from the *Catonis disticha* to Priscian, with a total of above thirty thousand hexameters. Commodian was excluded, as belonging to a class by himself. From a statistical table covering the poets mentioned it was proved that Claudian and Prudentius differ in their treatment of pyrrhic words in the fifth foot to an extent which would at first appear almost incredible, Claudian having but *six* examples in 9326 hexameters, while Prudentius admitted no less than 221 in a total of 5149 verses (neglecting *sine* and *super*). An analysis of Claudian's instances showed that all are easy of explanation, three being clear cases of enclisis or proclisis (*ac simul* and *et vice mira* and *haec mihi* [pers. pron. enclitic to the demonstr.]; *Gigant.* 111, *VI Cons. Honor.* 533, in *Rufin.* i. 204). In the three remaining cases, also, the same principle sufficiently covers the ground. Two of these follow *et* (and in each instance a tetrasyllabic Greek word precedes), the pyrrhic itself being an unemphatic word of rather indefinite meaning, immediately defined by a following phrase upon which the emphasis falls (*et freta*, in *Rufin.* i. 173, *et nova*, *Bell. Poll.* 9). Finally, an example of a predicate noun enclitic to its subject, with verb omitted (*telae labor*, *R.P.* iii. 204).

That Claudian so very rarely allowed a pyrrhic word in the fifth foot is all the more remarkable because so many instances can be found in Vergil (162 cases may be obtained from Professor Humphreys's table, *TAPA.*, 1878, p. 43). The only possible inference is that Claudian, with a more definite aim to secure

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the references given by Edmiston, *PAPA.* xxxiv (1903), xxvi f.

coincidence of accent and ictus in the cadence of the verse, declined the Vergilian liberty of inserting an unaccented dissyllable, as disturbing to the desired harmony, and not to be defended as merely a trifling discord, especially in the case of unemphatic words. Thus Claudian attempts to go much further than his master in this direction, and in isolated instances only does he admit the principle of phrase-accent, which in Vergil appears to cover a large number of the examples.

In contrast with Claudian's excessive strictness is the freedom of Prudentius, who saw no violation of any metrical canon in the frequent admission of words which in the nature of the case must lose their accent. And in a great many of these instances it is quite absurd to apply the theory of enclisis, or attempt otherwise to deny the very mechanical methods of composition. While he evidently desired coincidence of accent and ictus in this part of the verse, he was quite ready to insert even an emphatic word with neither an accent of its own, nor a substitute in the form of phrase-accent. Of the other poets examined Avienus and Ausonius are found on the side of Prudentius, with 117 instances in 3331 hexameters and 61 in a total of 3427, respectively. The others are rather to be classed with Claudian. Priscian has but three cases in 1399 verses, all fully covered by enclisis, in spite of the difficulty of placing the proper names in a geographical poem.

The paper also included statistics of monosyllabic endings for the same list of poets, showing Claudian and Prudentius again at opposite poles. The former was found to have but nine monosyllabic endings (omitting *si quis*, and the like, as practically dissyllables; also *ille est* (for the same reason)), while the latter has 116 examples, Ausonius 61 (neglecting the *Technop.*), and Avienus 27. Claudian's examples are (1) prepositional phrases, *in te, ex quo, per te*; (2) a stereotyped expression, *fas est (bis)*; (3) a monosyllable following a quadrisyllable, as *occiduus sol (bis)*, etc.,—reminiscences of Ennius and Vergil. Here also Claudian endeavored to follow a stricter canon than Vergil.

## 8. On the Meaning of *προμαντεία*, by Professor M. L. D'Ooge, of the University of Michigan.

The traditional definition of this word is *precedence in consulting the oracle*. So e.g. Photius, τὸ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων χρῆσθαι τῷ ἐν Δέλφοις μαντεῖ· ἦν δὲ προεδρία τὸ αὐτό. The word occurs frequently in inscriptions recording the decrees of the Delphic priesthood and of the Amphictyons, and is coupled in such decrees with *προξενία, προεδρία, προδικία, ἀστυλία* (cf. *Bull. Corr. Hellen.* XXI, 104 ff.).

Since these decrees are so numerous, the question arises how can *προμαντεία* mean this and this only, and how could this right be exercised when so many clients could lay claim to it at the same time? The object of this present discussion is to show that *προμαντεία* may also mean *the consulting of the oracle on behalf of or for another*, and probably does mean that generally. When, therefore, a state or a person had decreed to it or to him the *προμαντεία* by the Delphic priesthood a privilege was bestowed to which such a state or person had no natural right. The traditional meaning, on the other hand, implies that any one had the right to consult the oracle who chose, and that the *προμαντεία* simply conferred the first chance or priority.

The first scholar to throw doubt on the correctness of the traditional meaning of *προμαντεία* is Homolle in a discussion of an inscription found at Delphi (cf. *Bull. Corr. Hellen.* XIX, 1), which belongs to the end of the fifth century B.C. and deals with the regulations concerning the phratries of the Labyadae.

The pertinent part of the inscription is this (p. 12): πάντων καὶ φιδίων καὶ δαμοσίων τὸν προθύοντα καὶ προμαντευόμενον παρέχεν τὰ γεγραμμένα. Laβιάδαις. Homolle points out that the meaning of *προθύειν* here is determined by another inscription from Delphi which runs thus (Dittenberger, *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 484): καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἀξιοὶ Ματροφάνης ἀποδείξει τὸν προθύσοντα διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχειν πρόξενον Σαρδιανοῖς, οὐ δυνατῶν ὄντων πλειονος χρόνου παραγενέσθαι εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον διὰ τὰς αἰτίας ἃς ἀπελογίσαστο Ματροφάνης προθύειν αὐτῷ τὰν πόλιν. From this inscription it appears that Matrophanes was charged with the duty of consulting the oracle (this is stated in line 2 of the inscription not quoted here), and to do this he must first sacrifice. For this purpose he needs the services of a *πρόξενος*. But Sardis had at that time no *πρόξενος* at Delphi. Matrophanes, therefore, asked the city of Delphi ἀποδείξει τὸν προθύσοντα, and it voted: *προθύειν αὐτῷ τὰν πόλιν*, i.e. to offer a sacrifice for him. This interpretation of *προθύειν* is confirmed by two inscriptions cited by Dittenberger (*op. cit.* 565, 627) of which what follows is particularly pertinent: μὴ ἐξεῖναι κατάρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ Ἑραῖον ξένω, and ἦν ξένος ἱεροποιῇ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι προιεράσθαι τῶν ἀστών [i.e. of the Milesians] ὃν ἂν θέλῃ ὁ ξένος. According to these inscriptions a stranger must obtain an intermediary to offer sacrifice for him. *προθύειν* then means *to sacrifice on behalf of or for*.

This is, however, not always its sense. *E.g.* in Plato *Crat.* 401 D, τὸ γὰρ πρὸ πάντων θεῶν τῇ Ἑστίᾳ πρώτῃ προθύειν, the temporal sense of *πρὸ* is clear. Since this paper was presented, an article on *προθύειν* has appeared in the *Rheinisches Museum*, N.F., LXIX, 391 ff., by Ziehen, in which the writer tries to show that in the classical period *προθύειν* can only mean *to offer before (vorher opfern)*. This view does violence, *me judice*, to the use of *προθύειν* in several passages, as *e.g.* Eur. *Ion* 805, παιδὸς προθύσων ξένια καὶ γένεθλα, where *παιδὸς* is naturally connected with *προθύσων*, and in the alleged letter of Olympias to Alexander (*Athen.* xiv, p. 659): ὅσα τε Ὀλυμπιάς προθύεται, where Ziehen suspects the genuineness of the word *προθύεται*. The effort to show that the *πρὸ* in *προθύειν* always must have the temporal sense of *before* overshoots the mark.

I hold with Homolle that *προμαντεία* stands on the same footing as *προθυσία*, *προδικία*, and that in these compounds the sense of *πρὸ* oscillates between a temporal and a local sense out of which grows the derived meaning of *for, in behalf of*. In *προεδρία* the local sense is of necessity fixed. The view that *πρὸ* in *προμαντεία* does not indicate priority or precedence receives support from the word *πρόμαντις* which is applied to the Pythia, where the *πρὸ* certainly does not refer to priority, but may be equivalent to our *forth* in such a word as *to speak forth*, or *pro in proclaim*. The meaning of *προμαντεία* for which I contend seems further to be confirmed by the regulation according to which priority in consulting the oracle was determined by lot, except in the case of Sparta and possibly a few other states which seem to have possessed this privilege as an ancient right.

That such a right of priority in consulting the oracle was sometimes granted is not denied, and is shown, *e.g.*, by a Thessalian inscription (cf. *Athen. Mitt.* VII, 72): καὶ εἰσαγέτω κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς ἐκάστης ἀναγραφῆς ἀνακαλούμενος, εἰ μὴ τισιν

συγκεχώρηται πρώτοις ελπίεσθαι. That such priority may be indicated by *προμαντεία* is not denied, as, e.g., probably in Dem. ix, 32; xix, 327; our only contention is that *προμαντεία* may also mean *the consulting of the oracle for or in behalf of another*, or through an intermediary, and then for oneself. The *πρό* thus in one case = *before*, in another *for*, just as it does, e.g., in *προθνήσκω* = *to die before*, or *to die for*.<sup>1</sup>

Remarks were made by Professors Seymour and Smyth.

### 9. The Homeric Hades and the Dead, by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale University.

In the discussion of no question pertaining to the life and thought of the Greeks of the Homeric Age, is common sense more needed than in the attempt to determine what was the belief of the Homeric poet with regard to the existence of the soul on its departure from the body, but in no discussion have the reins of fancy been left so free, and in none has the element of common sense been more frequently and conspicuously lacking. Sentimental motives for honorable treatment of dead bodies have often been disregarded, yet in this matter sentiment is almost supreme. Many old Greek customs find parallels in modern usages from which no one dares to infer even the beliefs of preceding generations. Another frequent error of writers on this subject is the demand for consistency. The Funeral Games in honor of Patroclus are thought to be so inconsistent with the belief that the soul of Patroclus was as incorporeal as smoke, that some scholars would attribute the one view to an Aeolic and the other to an Ionic poet, requiring of the epic poet greater consistency than is found in Pindar, or even in Plato or in Dante. That many customs in the burial of the dead and in the honors paid at their tombs were based originally on beliefs with regard to the connexion of the soul with the body, is not disputed. The analogy of modern usages, however, warns the scholar that the belief may have ceased long before the practice which is based upon it, and great caution should be exercised in making inferences from usages.

The paper closed with two theses, briefly sustained : 1. The Homeric Tartarus does not differ from Hades as the mediaeval Hell differed from Purgatory. The punishment of the gods who were sent thither consists, not in their physical discomfort, but in their separation from their kindred. 2. The belief that Homeric perjurers are punished in Hades rests only on *Iliad*, iii. 278, where the peculiar use and position of *καμόντας* indicate that the text is not in good condition. The office of the Erinyes was not to punish after death, but during life; and nothing elsewhere indicates that Hades and Persephone ever punished any one,—this was not their function.

Remarks upon the paper were made by Professor Shorey and the author.

<sup>1</sup> My attention has been called to a discussion of the meaning of *προμαντεία* by Legrand, *Rev. des Études Grecques*, XIII, pp. 290 ff., which I have not yet seen.

10. The Problem of ἀλλοίωσις in Pre-Socratic Philosophy, by Professor W. A. Heidel, of Iowa College.

Historians of Greek philosophy have much to say of ἀλλοίωσις, or qualitative change, and assume, even when they do not state in express terms, that the Aristotelian conception, essentially unchanged, may be found in the pre-Socratics. Nobody seems to have considered the question critically to ascertain whether this view is tenable. The truth or falsity of the view is however of the greatest interest, as the conception is all but fundamental to a knowledge of the development of Greek thought.

It is impossible to epitomize the study which the writer has made of the pre-Socratic philosophies in his desire to determine the mode of change which we have come to call "qualitative." But it may be said that the traditional view rests entirely upon the Aristotelian reports, whereas the original documents, wherever available, strongly support the theory that the pre-Socratics one and all regarded this kind of change as mechanically conditioned and as essentially identical with μῆξις. Even where μῆξις and ἀλλοίωσις appear to differ, the latter rests upon the primitive conception of "quality," as constituted by the ingredients of a substance, change of quality being nothing but change of ingredients.

The greatest difficulty is met in determining the nature of the changes wrought by condensation and rarefaction. This process itself suggests a mode of transformation wholly mechanical; and in its historic application it is constantly associated with the segregation of like unto like from a mass only nominally unified or homogeneous. The typical process of segregation of like unto like is found in the scheme of evaporation and precipitation, which is in turn equated with rise and fall in temperature. These associated changes are all mechanical, and, in the pre-Socratics, reveal no connection with occult processes such as are implied in the Aristotelian theory of ἀλλοίωσις.

The paper signalizes numerous instances in which Aristotle and the doxographic tradition import into the thought of the pre-Socratics notions which were of later origin. It is hoped that the study will serve to clarify the history of Greek thought in a most important direction.

This paper was requested for the TRANSACTIONS, but will appear in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*. It was discussed by Professors Shorey and J. H. Wright.

11. On the Principle and Terminology of Motion in the Pre-Socratic Cosmogonies, by Professor Paul Shorey, of the University of Chicago (read by title, with a brief *résumé*).

This paper is reserved for the next volume of the TRANSACTIONS.

12. Supplementary Note on the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum, by Professor Elmer Truesdell Merrill, of Wesleyan University (read by title).

Three years ago I had the honor of reading before the Association a paper on the historical interpretation of the sculptures of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum,



which paper was published in full in the *TRANSACTIONS*. Since that time I have had opportunity to review thoroughly in the presence of the Arch itself the views therein expressed, and to weigh against them on the spot the published articles referred to in my former paper, as well as certain later suggestions and criticisms with which various friends have kindly favored me. I cannot take space in this short note in the *PROCEEDINGS* to enter upon extended argument, but must content myself here with the brief and crude statement that the added two-days' study of the sculptures under favorable conditions has not led to any change in my earlier views on matters concerned with interpretation. Nor could I convince myself that the eyes of the friends who have differed with me on points of actual fact in the mutilated stone have not been in error. For example, in the relief that depicts the mustering in of recruits (the upper relief on the left pier of the outer face) I was unable to make out that the measuring rod was of any other than the  $\Gamma$ -shape. The rod held in the left hand of the 'centurion' appears not to run in the right direction to make it a part of the measuring-rod (which would then be of the  $\sqcap$ -shape). Furthermore, it is not of the right section to be a part of the measuring-rod. It seems, to be sure, to be cut somewhat angularly on the left side, so as to throw it into clear relief against the folds of the recruit's tunic, in the approximate plane of which it lies; but its general roundness otherwise does not appear to be due to accident or to the wear of time. It quite surely never had the strictly rectangular section of the measuring-rod as depicted in the lowest plane of the relief.

May I venture to go one step farther, and this time outside of the determination of actual fact into the realm of probability? If there is no direct evidence that the military stature-gauge was of the  $\sqcap$ -shape (and if there be any, I must plead guilty to ignorance of it), it would not seem impertinent to suggest that the Roman mind might see very good reason for avoiding that especial shape. It was precisely that of the ill-famed 'yoke.' Is it likely — is it readily conceivable — that a people who attached so much importance to omens would usher a recruit into the service from 'under the yoke'?

A careful inspection of the curious and mutilated object held in the left hand of Jupiter, in the lowest relief on the outer face of the arch, to the left of the arcade, revealed nothing more satisfactory to my puzzled conception. It still does not appear to me to be the remains of a thunderbolt, nor yet does it suggest precisely enough the usual form of a neolithic celt, — if the progress of palaeo-ethnology still allows us to use that antiquated term. But I must stand by my former interpretation.

To the evidence that the inner face of the arch was considered and treated as its principal face I may add two points omitted in my former paper. The conventional representation of Victory crowning the emperor that fills the centre of the crown of the arch-vault is placed with the heads of the figures toward the city; that is, a person passing out of the city through the arch on looking up sees the figures in their natural position. The architect had the choice of two orientations for his group. Does it seem likely that, if he had considered the outer face of the arch to be its principal face, he would deliberately have chosen to place this group so that an observer approaching the arch from the direction of its principal face would see Victory and the emperor standing on their heads?

The other point I may preface with the reminder that Professor Petersen,

I think, was the first to point out that in every scene on the faces of the arch in which Trajan appears, his figure is turned toward the centre of the arch. Such a uniformity of orientation was of course not mere chance. Now I desire to remark that in each of the two reliefs (of the *congiarium* and the imperial sacrifice) that flank the arcade on either side, the figure of the emperor is so placed that it faces the spectator approaching from the city, and turns its back upon him if he enters from without. It does not appear reasonable to believe that, if the architect thought of the outer face of the arch as its principal face, he would plant the emperor's back toward the spectator approaching from that direction. Here, then, are two additional reasons for believing that the inner, and not the outer, face of the arch was meant to be viewed as its initial and principal face.

This paper was requested for the TRANSACTIONS, but the author has preferred that it should appear in the form of an abstract.

13. The Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy, Julius Obsequens, and Cassiodorus, by Professor Clifford H. Moore, of Harvard University (read by Professor Slaughter).

That the Oxyrhynchus Epitome and the list of consuls drawn up by Cassiodorus come from a common source is proved (1) by their agreement in the names of the consuls for 149 B.C.: O l. 88, L. Marcio Censorino M. *Manlio* cos.; Cass., L. Marcius et M. *Manlius*; but the correct form of the name is given by all other authorities — *Manilius*; (2) by the notice under the year 186 B.C.: O ll. 42 f., at[hletarum cer]tamina primum a Ful[vio Nobilior]e edita; Cass., His consulibus athletarum certamina primum a Fulvio edita. Livy's words (39, 22, 2) are, athletarum certamen tum primo *Romanis spectaculo fuit*. Mommsen (*Die Chronik des Cassiodorus*, 1861, p. 552) showed that Julius Obsequens and Cassiodorus drew from a common source, so that logically we can postulate the same relation between O and Obsequens as between O and Cassiodorus. Specific proof is given by the general style of Obsequens, agreement with O in phraseology, and by a comparison of the notice of the *sacrarium* and sacred laurel, Obs. 19, with O ll. 127-129. Furthermore, a comparison of these three authors with others who drew directly or indirectly from Livy shows that the source of O, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus was not used by the majority, at least.

This paper has appeared in full in No. 99 of the *American Journal of Philology*.

14. Notes on the Influence of Lucretius on Vitruvius, by Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California (read by Professor Bill).

So far as I know, attention has not been called to the influence of Lucretius on Vitruvius, and it has seemed worth while to note their similarity in diction, and their mutual relation in other respects. Vitruvius names Lucretius once indeed (ix. 3, 17 = p. 218, 5, ed. Rose-Müller-Strübing), but he not only discusses from time to time matters that had been previously touched upon by Lucretius, but also in many parts of his work he has employed parallelisms of ex-

pression. At the very beginning of the treatise Vitruvius has one of his laborious prooemia that seems to have much in common with the *laudes Epicuri* in the 1st, 5th, and particularly the 3d book of Lucretius, as may be seen from the following parallel columns: —

VITRUVIUS I. <i>Proem.</i>	LUCRETIUS.
Cum divina tua mens	3, 15 divina mente.
et numen . . .	3, 18 divum numen.
imperio potiretur orbis terrarum	2, 13 rerumque potiri.
invictaque virtute . . .	1, 68 quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec minitanti   murmure compressit caelum, sed eo magis acrem   inritat animi virtutem.
victoriaque tua	1, 79 nos exaequat victoria caelo.
cives gloriarentur	5, 3 qui fingere laudes   pro meritis eius possit.
et gentes omnes subactae . . .	5, 49 qui cuncta subegerit.
liberatus timore . . .	3, 16 diffugiunt animi terrores.
gubernaretur	5, 77 natura gubernans.
magnis cogitationibus edere . . .	1, 72 vivida vis animi.
maiestas imperii . . .	1, 21 Ennius edens.
in sedibus immortalibus . . .	5, 7 maiestas . . . rerum.
fui praesto . . .	3, 18 apparet divom numen sedesque quietae.
et commoda accepi.	2, 1068 locus est praesto.
quae . . . tribuisti . . .	3, 2 commoda vitae.
eo beneficio essem obligatus . . .	3, 10 suppeditas praecepta.
non haberem inopiae timorem . . .	5, 50 nonne decebit   hunc hominem numero divum dignariet esse.
praescriptiones terminatas . . . aperui . . .	3, 65 acris egestas   semota ab dulci stabilique videtur.
disciplinae rationes.	1, 77 alte terminus haerens.
	2, 182 faciemus aperta.
	1, 105 vitae rationes.

Probably Vitruvius had read and admired the prooemia of Lucretius, and in composing his dedication to *Imperator Caesar* he was influenced by the Lucretian praise of Epicurus. Somewhat farther on he gives one of Epicurus's definitions: praeterea de rerum natura quae graece *φυσιολογία* dicitur philosophia explicat (p. 5, 20). On p. 16 sq. there seems to be another localization of Lucretian influence: —

VITRUVIUS I, 4, 3.	LUCRETIUS.
calor cum excoquit . . .	calor, <i>passim</i> . — 6, 962 terram sol excoquit.
vaporibus fervidis	vapor, <i>passim</i> . — 1, 491 ferventia vapore.
( <i>Vapor</i> is frequent elsewhere in V.)	
ferrum . . . tinctum frigida redurescit . . .	6, 968 umor aquae porro ferrum condurat ab igni.

## VITRUVIUS I, 4, 3.

non possunt durare sed  
dissolvuntur . . .  
non laborant . . .  
namque e principiis quae Graeci στοι-  
χεία appellant . . .

figurantur . . .  
generatim . . .  
fervidum . . . caelum . . .

apertas venas.

## LUCRETIVS.

6, 969 mollit durata calore.  
6, 963 glaciem dissolvit.  
3, 730 quareve laborent; cf. 6, 395, etc.  
1, 198 sine principiis. (*Principiis* is the  
Lucretian dative and ablative form  
of *primordia*.)  
2, 412 organici quae figurant.  
1, 20 generatim.  
5, 282 inrigat caelum candore.  
5, 659 caelum . . . accendere . . .  
5, 812 venis . . . apertis.

The sketch of the beginnings of society given in the second chapter of the second book (p. 33, 14 sq.) has much in common with Lucretius:—

## VITRUVIUS II, 1, 1.

Homines veteri more ut ferae in silvis  
et speluncis et nemoribus nascebantur  
ciboque agresti vescendo

vitam exigebant.  
interea quodam in loco ab tempestati-  
bus et ventis densae crebritatibus  
arbores agitatae et inter se terentes  
ramos ignem excitaverunt . . .

nutu monstrantes . . .  
cotidiana consuetudine vocabula ut ob-  
tigerant constituerunt . . .  
ergo cum propter ignis inventionem  
conventus initio apud homines et  
concilium et convictus esset natus,

et in unum locum plures convenirent . . .

coeperunt . . . alii de fronde facere tecta,  
alii speluncas fodere sub montibus, . . .

## LUCRETIVS.

5, 955 sed nemora atque cavos montis  
silvasque colebant.  
5, 939 glandiferas inter curabant cor-  
pora quercus.  
5, 932 vitam tractabant more ferarum.  
5, 1096 et ramosa tamen cum ventis  
pulsata vaccillans | aestuat in ramos  
incumbens arboris arbor, | exprimi-  
tur validis extritibus viribus ignis | et  
micat interdum flammae fervidus ar-  
dor, | mutua dum inter se rami stir-  
pesque teruntur . . .  
5, 1022 gestu cum balbe significarent.  
5, 1029 utilitas expressit nomina rerum.  
5, 1105 inque dies magis hi victum vi-  
tamque priorem | commutare novis  
monstrabant rebus et igni | ingenio  
qui praestabant. [Thus *et igni*  
should be retained, and 1091-1160  
should not be bracketed.]  
5, 1108 condere coeperunt urbis arcem-  
que locare . . .  
5, 1011 casas . . . pararunt.  
5, 954 cavos montis silvasque colebant.  
5, 984 fugiebant saxea tecta.

Probably both followed a common authority, yet I cannot but believe that Vitruvius has some Lucretian reminiscences here.

In § 6 (p. 35, 26) sollertia ingenia exercendo per consuetudinem ad artes per-  
venissent may be compared with Lucretius 5, 1452 usus et impigrae simul experi-  
entia mentis | paulatim docuit pedetentim progredientis | . . . namque alid ex

alio clarescere corde videbant, | artibus ad summum donec venere cacumen. And p. 36, 4 natura . . . subiecisset cetera animalia sub potestate agrees in thought with Lucretius, 5, 860 sq. On p. 50, l. 22, Vitruvius's humanitatis dulcedine mollitis animis reminds one of Lucretius, 5, 1014 genus humanum primum mollescere coepit.

In Book vi, prooem. 2, there is another series of reminiscences :—

VITRUVIUS (p. 132, 5).	LUCRETIVS.
difficilesque fortunae sine timore posse despicere casus, at qui non doctri- narum sed felicitatis praesidiis puta- ret se esse vallatum . . .	2, 7 sed nil dulcius est, bene quam mu- nita tenere   edita doctrina sapien- tum templa serena,   despicere unde queas alios.
Epicurus . . . ait pauca sapientibus for- tunam tribuere, quae autem maxima et necessaria sunt, animi mentisque cogitationibus gubernari.	2, 20 pauca videmus   esse opus . . . 5, 1118 divitiae grandes homini sunt vivere parce. 3, 139 animum mentemque. 5, 1117 si quis vera vitam ratione gu- bernet.

In treating one of the stock illustrations of the physicists Vitruvius also agrees with Lucretius :—

VITRUVIUS VI, 2, 2 (p. 139, 13).	LUCRETIVS.
in navibus remi cum sint sub aqua di- recti, tamen oculis infracti videntur,	4, 438 nam quaecumque supra rorem salis edita pars est   remorum, recta est, . . . quae . . . liquorem obeunt, refracta videntur.
et quatenus eorum partes tangunt sum- mam planitiem liquoris, apparent uti sunt directi, . . .	4, 294 planitiem ad speculi veniens.
fluentes imagines . . .	4, 63 debet imago   ab rebus mitti. 4, 156 apparet imago ;   perpetuo fluere ut noscas e corpore summo.
sive simulacrorum impulsu	4, 164 simulacra ferantur. 4, 191 simulacra . . . transcurrere . . . quod . . . causa . . . propellat.
falsa iudicia oculorum habeat aspec- tus . . .	4, 464 pars horum maxima fallit   prop- ter opinatus animi. 4, 520 ratio tibi rerum prava . . . falsis . . . sensibus.
vera falsa.	4, 519 iudiciis fallacibus. 4, 481 veris . . . falsa.

In the prooemium of Book vii he again seems to remember the praises of Epicurus, but I have noted no special imitation unless possibly unde nos uti fontibus haurientes aquam—Lucr. 1, 928—may be one. In vii, 5, 4 (p. 173, 9) haec autem nec sunt nec fieri possunt nec fuerunt reminds one of Lucr. 5, 878 neque Centauri fuerunt, nec tempore in ullo | esse queunt duplici natura.

The prooemium of Book viii has also a Lucretian coloring. I note, however, sine quibus mortalium vita non potest esse tuta, ea fudit ad manum parata

per omnem mundum, — Lucr. 6, 9 nam cum vidit hic ad victum quae flagitat usus | omnia iam ferme mortalibus esse parata | et, proquam posset, vitam consistere tutam. And in the prooemium to Book ix there is a reminiscence — perpetua vita (p. 212, 10) = Lucr. 3, 13. His account of Berosus's theory of the moon (p. 224, 22) is similar to Lucretius's discussion in 5, 720 sq.

Simulacra natura divinaque mente designata, ut Democrito physico placuit, exposui (p. 231, 18) might be regarded as Lucretian prose.

I add a list of Lucretian words and phrases that occur in Vitruvius's vocabulary: —

ab rerum natura procreata, 172, 22	Lucr. 2, 880.
adaugebitur, 95, 5	2, 296.
aeris raritas, 56, 10	6, 1024, etc.
breviter percipere, 103, 26	Cf. 4, 115.
candens, 108, 25	6, 148.
capita fluminum, 190, 10	6, 636.
coaluerint (coluerint), 181, 4	2, 1061.
confervescendo, 181, 4	6, 353.
confervefaciunt, 182, 20	6, 353.
conglomeretur, 180, 30	3, 210.
corporum figuris, 138, 14	1, 685.
dilabantur, 186, 10	5, 311.
doneque, 129, 22, etc.	donique, 2, 1116, etc.
excoquit, 108, 26	6, 962.
flatus, 27, 16	5, 689.
impetum caeli, 188, 12	5, 200.
inminuit, 108, 26	5, 626.
intactus, 104, 7	6, 1060.
iactari, 133, 26	3, 47.
liquescent, 186, 10	4, 1114.
montium radices, 188, 4	6, 695.
mundi (= caeli), 198, 3	4, 134.
mundi versatione, 232, 5	mundi versatile templum, 5, 1436.
notities, 133, 9	5, 1047.
offensa, 103, 12	3, 941 ?
planitia, 130, 2	planitiem, 4, 294.
potestatibus, 56, 5	2, 587.
recidere, 183, 22	1, 857.
summatim exponam, 148, 29	s. attingere, 3, 261.
tacta pruina, 53, 17	6, 903.
umores, 108, 26	6, 1176.
vehemens aquae vis, 284, 7	vemens imber, 6, 517.
	aquai vim, 1, 285.
versatile, 263, 21	5, 1436.
viduatus, 119, 9	5, 840.

The conclusion that I would draw from this examination is that Vitruvius in his prooemia was influenced by the Lucretian *laudes Epicuri*, and that owing to a similarity in subject-matter he sometimes used Lucretian words of a some-

what technical nature. He had read and studied the *de Rerum Natura*, particularly the 4th, 5th, and 6th books.

The paper was discussed by Professors Shorey, Heidel, Lanman, and Slaughter.

As members of the Committee to audit the Treasurer's Report, the President appointed Professors Lanman and Heidel.

The following Committee on the Time and Place of Meeting in 1905 was also appointed: Professors Elmer and F. G. Moore, and Dr. Bolling.

Adjourned at 12.15 P.M.

#### FOURTH SESSION.

Saturday afternoon, September 17, 1904.

The Association was called to order at 3.15 P.M.

15. The Çāntikalpa of the Atharva-Veda, by Dr. George Melville Bolling, of the Catholic University of America.

This text has been printed in the TRANSACTIONS, with introduction, critical notes, translation, and commentary.

16. The Criticism of the Atharva-Veda, by Professor Charles R. Lanman, of Harvard University.

Professor Lanman presented to the Association a brief account of the contents of his Critical Introduction to the Atharva-Veda, which he had recently finished, and which is to precede the translation of that Veda made by the late Professor Whitney of Yale. Whitney's translation is accompanied by an elaborate critical and exegetical commentary. The Critical Introduction takes up, one after another, the various sources of traditional information which may serve to guide us in forming a critical opinion respecting the original form of the text of the Atharva-Veda. Since the whole system of oral tradition by memory in India is so entirely different from the system which has obtained in the handing down of the great literary monuments of classical antiquity, it was thought that an explanation of the peculiar situation in India might be not without its peculiar interest for the students of classical text-criticism. In particular, the value of what we may call the living manuscripts, that is to say, the oral reciters of the text, was explained, and it was shown how their testimony was often of use to check errors which might very easily be made by the eye, but could not possibly be made through the medium of the ear. Attention was also called to the famous phonetic treatises called *Prātiçākhyas*, which the Hindus produced with a special view to the conservation of the purity of the sacred texts, and the prevention of any, even the slightest, errors of orthography and accent. Since the Critical Introduction itself is already printed in full in the seventh volume of the Harvard Oriental Series, it is unnecessary to go into further detail here.

17. Plato's Simile of the Cave, by Professor John H. Wright, of Harvard University.

The use of the figure of a cave to illustrate human life and knowledge (in Book VII of the *Republic*) may have been suggested to Plato by the words of Empedocles, or by Orphic lore, if it was not inevitable in the development of the illustration, used in the preceding book, of the sun as a symbol of the Form of Good. But many of the peculiar features of the cave that are described in detail by Plato seem to point to a more specific source of influence. The speaker hazarded the conjecture that in elaborating the picture of the cave, Plato was influenced by recollections of the cave at Vari, which in many respects is unlike other Greek caves, and in several particulars very remarkably meets the requirements of Plato's description. The cave at Vari — a seat of the worship of Pan and the Nymphs — was, at the time Plato might have visited it, richly supplied with images and votive offerings. Near the end of its broad, but very deep slope, was a long platform, upon which worshippers evidently performed dances in honor of Pan and the Nymphs, the platform being roughly parallel with the wall of the cave in front of it. The reflection of these dancing figures, possibly carrying their offerings, in the firelight upon the interior of the wall of the cave may well have suggested to Plato the figure of a made roadway, upon which, according to him, images were carried, the reflections of which appeared as realities to the prisoners who are conceived as chained at the broad base of the slope, along the front of the wall, and facing it. (It may be noted that in the *Phaedrus*, which appears to have been composed at about the same time as the seventh book of the *Republic*, Pan and the Nymphs, with their votive offerings, figure conspicuously.) Such an association of Plato with this cave is justified by the familiar legend of his babyhood, according to which he was carried by his parents to a spot on Hymettus, sacred to Pan and the Nymphs (Aelian, *V.H.* 10, 21; Olympiodorus, *Vita Platonis*, p. 1; cf. Weller, *A.J.A.* VII (1903), p. 28). What is more probable than that Plato revisited this cave in later life? He mentions no other caves in his works, and the grottos of Syracuse, with which he was familiar, are so unlike the cave that is described in the *Republic* as to rule out the idea that they could have been suggestive.

The paper was discussed by Professors Perry, Seymour, Smyth, D'Ooge, Shorey, and the author.

18. Alphabetic Notation of Variant Sounds, by Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College.

19. A Proposed Supplement to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, by Dr. Walter Hüllihen, of Grant University, Chattanooga.

The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, perhaps the most colossal undertaking in the history of modern scholarship, is an object of deep interest to every student of the classics, more particularly to Latinists. So small a fraction of the whole, however, has up to this time appeared that scholars generally have not yet had an opportunity to test its completeness or lack thereof; and it is with this, viz. completeness of citation, that this paper is concerned.



No one questions that a lexicon giving every occurrence of every word in the Latin language, between certain fixed points in its literature, would be an incalculable benefit to Latin scholarship. Other things being equal, the value of a lexicon to scholars varies as the number of examples quoted; but the lexicon which gives all examples leaps at once to a place by itself, so far does it transcend in usefulness any which are incomplete. All other considerations must, it seems to me, give precedence to this one of *completeness*. If the investigator have before him all examples of a certain word, which he is examining, he is unhampered by the disquieting fear that somewhere in the literature there may be examples that would impair or falsify his conclusions; he has the complete premises; if his conclusions are erroneous, the fault lies with himself. The difference in the degree of confidence inspired by a treatise based upon the consideration of all that bears upon its subject, as compared with one based upon only part, is very great; the truth of which is so obvious that it needs no argument to support it.

The assertion, therefore, may be made that the value and usefulness of the *Thesaurus* would be tremendously increased, if it cited every example of every word. The material has been collected and arranged in the buildings devoted to that purpose in Munich. Why shall it not be further utilized to make an already great work the greatest boon to Latin scholarship that can be conceived?

The extent in which the *Thesaurus* falls short of completeness may be seen from the following statistics in regard to the word *antequam*, of which word the writer has collected all examples from Plautus to Suetonius: under the word *antequam* in the *Thesaurus* (Vol. II, fasc. 1) only about *two-fifths* of the examples occurring in the literature from Plautus to Suetonius are cited; among those omitted are many of great importance to one investigating the syntax of *antequam*. It would not be pertinent to the object of this paper to enumerate and discuss these examples here. It is fairly evident that, in editing such a work as the *Thesaurus*, no human mind can make a *selection* of examples such that it will meet the needs of every investigator. Completeness is the remedy.

A lack of funds, Professor Wölfflin says, is the chief reason why the *Thesaurus*, as now being edited, is not more nearly complete. The income for the purpose of editing, subscribed almost in its entirety by five German Universities, is limited in amount and in the number of years it is to run; arrangements have been made with the Teubner press to issue twelve folio volumes of one thousand pages each; to this limit the editors are restricted, and estimated by that which has appeared they will even now exceed their limit. It thus becomes evident that following their present plan as to extent of quoted language, which has doubtless been considered with much care and critical judgment, the absence of valuable material becomes inevitable.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this paper is to ask the American Philological Association to take under consideration the publication of supplementary volumes, containing all of the examples omitted by the *Thesaurus*. For economy of space and expense these supplementary citations should be given without text, by numerical indices only. A careful calculation based upon the article on *antequam* shows that all of the examples omitted could be given by *numerical indices* in about one-eighth

<sup>1</sup> An interesting account of the methods employed and the difficulties met in editing the *Thesaurus* is given by Vollmer, *Neue Jahrbücher*, XIII, XIV, 1, 1904.

of the space occupied by the article as it stands in its present form. If, then, the word *antequam* can properly be taken as a basis for estimate, the supplementary volumes which will make the *Thesaurus* complete in its most essential particular, will add only a small fraction to the bulk of the publication, and will cost a correspondingly small fraction of the expense now being incurred. It is, of course, possible that the same proportion would not obtain for other words than *antequam*; but, even if this should prove true, and the fraction should prove to be greater, as much as one-fourth (which is highly improbable), is not that a small addition for so notable an increase in the value and usefulness of this monumental work? Cannot America raise this small fraction of the amount contributed by five German Universities? There seems little reason to doubt that the money can be raised, if the matter is put into the hands of the right men. An appeal to the Carnegie Institute may solve this difficulty. It is possible that such an appeal will have a better prospect of success than attended the project for an American Latin Dictionary several years ago, since the *Thesaurus* is an undertaking of *universal* interest and usefulness, and one which will stand out for centuries to come as one of the landmarks of classical research, as important in one country as in another. The amount needed will not be very great; probably not more than \$2500 or \$3000 a year, reckoning from the amount now being expended annually upon the *Thesaurus*.

If the Carnegie Institute is unwilling to give the money, it is conceivable that fifteen or twenty American Universities may be induced to combine to subscribe the amount needed; which will be employed to support two or three Latin Fellows at Munich, who shall work there under the control of a Committee of Direction in this country. (Of course, this presupposes that permission can be obtained from the Editors of the *Thesaurus* for such Fellows to use the already collected material.)

It seems probable that two or three men doing nothing but collecting and arranging citations, and freed from many of the embarrassing questions involved in the quotation of text, could keep pace with the rest of the work. It will be observed that these workers will have the tremendous advantage of having before them in the published fascicles of the *Thesaurus*, that part of the work which costs most labor and research. Revision of the work of these Fellows by a sufficiently large number of our maturer scholars will insure that degree of accuracy and scholarship which the *Thesaurus* must possess, as well in the supplementary volumes as in the main treatise.

Any further consideration of the details of the plan herewith presented would carry this paper beyond the limit prescribed. It is, therefore, submitted thus to the members of the Philological Association in the hope that some action will be inaugurated toward the accomplishment of the publication advocated.

The Auditing Committee reported that it had examined the Treasurer's Report and found the same correct.

20. Some Grammatical Myths, by Professor J. E. Harry, of the University of Cincinnati.

Of the twenty-five or thirty Greek grammars examined, all gave as much prominence to the perfect subjunctive, optative, and imperative active in the

paradigms as to the perfect indicative. Instead of throwing obstacles in the way of the beginner by compelling him to learn such mythical forms as these, we should help the tyro on his way by excising everything from our manuals, except essentials, both in form and in syntax. Sonnenschein in his preface claims that he has done this. His "scheme dispenses with a large number of unnecessary paradigms." In the advertisement of the authorized English translation of Kaegi's grammar a reference is made to the German grammarian's "omitting entirely or relegating to an unimportant place in his grammar all peculiarities or irregularities rarely met with." To the Roman the perfect subjunctive was indispensable; for the Greek the present and aorist sufficed; and the persistence of the perfect active in our grammars is doubtless due to a prepossession that Latin syntax and Greek syntax run on strictly parallel lines. The first sentence of Sonnenschein's preface runs: "The main object of this book is to turn to account for teaching purposes the close relation which exists between Latin and Greek . . . in . . . grammatical structure." Much that we find in Krüger and Kühner and Kaegi, as well as in Goodell and Babbitt and Goodwin and Hadley-Allen with their *πεπαύκω's* and *πεπαιδεύκω's* and *λελύκω's* would have made Sophocles and Thucydides open their eyes in wonderment. Jelf writes *βεβουλεύκω*. So Kühner, who translates: *ich habe geraten*. Krüger gives *λελύκω* and translates: *ich habe gelöst*, and *λελύκοιμι, möge gelöst haben*. Croiset and Petitjean (Paris, 1896) write *λελύκω* and render: *que j'aie fini de délier*. Isocrates uses the adverb *πεπαιδευμένως*; Plato employs the perfect indicative, infinitive, and participle of *παιδεύειν* by the score; but not a solitary example of the subjunctive, optative, or imperative active, which are so conspicuous in the paradigms of Kaegi and Kleist and Romana, can be found anywhere in Greek literature — *οὔτοι γάρ που μύθους τοῖς παῖσι ψευδεῖς συντιθέντες ἔλεγον τε καὶ λέγουσιν*. Goodwin, in his revised edition, comes nearer the truth than any of his predecessors or successors. Adjoining *λελύκω* (in parenthesis) is the number 720. This is to warn the unwary pupil to be on his guard. But how many would even take cognizance of the marginal reference — to say nothing of their being misled if they did? The note in Hadley-Allen (457) is even more misleading. Goodwin is a little more explicit with reference to the imperative.

There are only three or four perfect subjunctives in Greek literature. One of these is a Platonic idiosyncrasy (*Rep.* 614 A, *ἵνα τελέως αὐτῶν ἑκάτερος ἀπειλήφῃ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου ὀφειλόμενα ἀκοῦσαι*); the other example in Plato is a production of the Platonic passion for *ποικιλία* (*Rep.* 376 A, *ὃν μὲν ἂν ἴδῃ ἀγνώτα, χαλεπαίνει, οὐδὲν δὲ κακὸν ποροπονωθῶς· ὃν δ' ἂν γινώσκον, ἀσπάσεται, κἂν μὴδὲν πρόποτε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὸν πεπρόνθῃ*).<sup>1</sup> Xenophon's *λελήθης* (*Hippiarch.* 4, 15) hardly counts, while Demosthenes' *πεποιήκη* (19, 3) is not surprising to one who has watched the behavior of "active" and "passive" verbs (*πάσχειν* and *ποιεῖν*). Even the quasi-perfects (the periphrastic subjunctives) are practically confined to Xenophon (one or two in Plato, one or two in the whole Demosthenean corpus), and in Xenophon the participle is often a mere adjective. Periphrases in any mood with the aorist are rare, with the perfect frequent. Forms like *ὀλώλη* (*Δ* 164), *μεμήλη* (*ib.* 353), *δεδίη* (*Rep. Athen.* i, 11), *ἐφεστήκη* (Plato, *Sym.* 175 B),

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Crito* 43 B, *ἐπήγερας* . . . *ἡγειρον*, *Charm.* 153 C, *ἡγγέλται* . . . *ἀπήγγέλται*, *Protag.* 329 A, *ἐπερωτήσῃ* . . . *ἐρωτηθέντες*, *Euthyd.* 276 B, *ἀνεθορύβησαν* . . . *ἐθορύβησαν*.

ἐσθήκωμεν (Xen. *Anab.* 6, 5, 10), though not common, are found, inasmuch as they are virtual presents, in all periods of the literature.

Even the periphrastic active, which is emphasized by all the manuals, is very rare and is confined to one or two verbs. In some cases the periphrastic form is merely a variant for the regular perfect (present), e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* 8, 7, ἐπειδὴν ἐστηκότα ᾗ. The participle here is felt as an adjective pure and simple, the verbal idea in the participle being neutralized by the verb with which it is juxtaposed.

The grammarians cannot escape criticism for giving such a prominent place to the perfect subjunctive in the paradigm by saying that it was intended to be a model for such forms as ἐστήκη, for they invariably — German, French, Italian, English — attempt to give the *force* of the perfect in translation.

There are very few examples of the perfect optative in -κοιμι, -κοις, -κοι. Herodotus has πεποιήκοι once, Xenophon ἐμπεπτώκοι once, Lysias ὠφλήκοι once. Plato shows πεπόνθοι, but under circumstances that prove that it was yielded only under pressure. The pure perfect optative middle and passive is even rarer than the active. In Andocides 2, 24 we read ὅτ' ἂν μοι δικαίως διαβεβλήσθῃ, where any other writer would probably have used the periphrastic form, e.g. Xen. *An.* 7, 6, 44, διαβεβλημένος εἴη. Cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 255 A, εἰδὼν διαβεβλημένος ᾗ. Present optatives in perfect form occur as early as Homer (Ω 745, μεμνήμην) and appear in all departments of literature. The form τεθναίην is common. Euripides has κεκτόμεθα, Aristophanes κεκλήμεθα, μεμνήτο, Andocides μεμνήσθῃ, Xenophon κεκτῆτο. Even the periphrastic forms of the perfect optative active are very rare in the earlier language, and are not frequent in any authors except Plato, Xenophon, and Demosthenes; and the passive is not so common as might be supposed, hardly appearing in the language at all before Euripides, and in prose by no means frequent except in Xenophon and Plato.

Krüger is the only grammarian who has been careful enough to bracket the perfect imperative active. That the passive is often used is well known; but even this form is not found very frequently outside of Plato's *Latws*. In the orators hardly any other form besides the inevitable εἰρήσθω occurs, and even this not painfully frequent. But in Plato, who uses more imperative passives (and actives too for that matter) in the third person (hundreds in the *Latws* alone) than all the Greek authors together, the perfect imperative passive would be expected, and we are not surprised to find an occasional ὠμολογήσθω, τετολήμῃσθω, ἀπειργάσθω, πεπλάσθω, ἀπολελογίσθω, ὠναμάσθω, δεδόςθω, λελέχθω, πεφάσθω, ἡρωτήσθω, κεχρησμφόθῃσθω, ἐπιδεδείχθω, πεπεράνθω, γεγράφθω, ἡτιμάσθω, δεδόχθω, νενομοτήσθω, ὠρίσθω, ἐπιτετράφθω.

This paper, with complete statistics, will be published as a University of Cincinnati Bulletin.

Adjourned at 6 P.M.

FIFTH SESSION.

Monday morning, September 19, 1904.

The session was opened at 10.20 A.M.

The President, Professor Hempl, reported for the Joint Committee on a Phonetic Alphabet.

On motion of Professor J. H. Wright it was

*Voted*, That the Association accepts the preliminary report of the Committee, and has a serious interest in the deliberations and recommendations of the Committee; that it requests the members of the Joint Committee that now represents the Association to continue in their present capacity, and to submit their final report, when this shall be ready; and that the Executive Committee be authorized to expend one hundred dollars, or thereabouts, towards the expenses of the Joint Committee.

21. The Latin Subjunctive of the Second Singular Indefinite as a Mood of Statement, by Professor William Gardner Hale, of the University of Chicago.

This paper will appear, it is hoped, in the next volume of the *TRANSACTIONS*. Remarks were made by Professors Ashmore and Elmer, and the author.

22. On the Minor and Problematic Indo-European Languages, by Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University.

This article was requested for the *TRANSACTIONS*, but appears here in abstract by the author's preference.

The question of the number and extent of the Indo-European peoples has both a positive and a negative side. Positively, the addition of an Indo-European people to the familiar list (Indo-Iranian, Greek, Latin, etc.) serves to increase our knowledge of I.-E. speech and I.-E. ethnology. Negatively, the exclusion of certain peoples from the I.-E. sisterhood calls attention to the limitations and foreign surroundings of our family of speech, and helps to determine its scope among the remaining linguistic families. This is a necessary preliminary to the question of the home of the Indo-Europeans before their separation into the ethnical units of historical times.

The Scythians that roamed to the north of Iran, in the Russian steppes about the Black and Caspian seas, were Indo-Europeans, connecting the Asiatic East Indo-Europeans (Indo-Iranians, or Aryans) with the Slavs in the northeast of Europe, and, through them, with the remaining North-Europeans, the Teutons and Celts. In this great belt there is no record of minor or problematic I.-E. peoples. With all the intricacies of ethnic and geographic interrelation between Celts and Teutons, and Teutons and Slavs, there is in the north of Europe no I.-E. dialect whose broader family traits are obscure, and no claimant for membership in the I.-E. family that is not freely admitted. Even in this region, however,

there may have existed other I.-E. peoples of independent character. There are no linguistic records from this area earlier than the first centuries after Christ: its remoteness from the ancient centres of civilization, Greece, Rome, and Western Asia, may have silenced records, either of other I.-E. languages, or of non-I.-E. languages in the northern continent of Europe. The solidarity of recorded I.-E. speech in the same area does not of itself prove that the proper or original home of the Indo-Europeans is to be sought there rather than elsewhere.

All records of minor or problematic I.-E. peoples are from the regions adjacent to the northeastern Mediterranean, that is to say, from the countries that came most directly under the influence of Greece and Rome. Beginning where France joins Italy in the ancient land of Liguria; stretching from there and adjoining Etruria across Venetia to Illyria, Thrace, and the rest of the Balkan peninsula; from there again, across Hellespont, Propontis, and Bosporus, in and clear through Asia Minor, including Armenia, until we touch again the Asiatic Iranians—that is the territory within which existing records of some sort point to the presence of varieties of Indo-Europeans outside of the well-known families.

Egyptian records and the Cuneiform inscriptions of western Asia might have shown, but they do not show additional traces of independent I.-E. languages. Recent attempts to pass the Kossaeen, Mitani, and Arezawa languages, or dialects, recorded in Cuneiform, as Indo-European have been confidently disproved by the present writer in an article, "On Some Alleged Indo-European Languages in Cuneiform Character" (*A.J.Ph.* XXV, 1 ff.). But, incidentally, there came to light the fact that the Mitani and other Western Asia records are sprinkled generously with Iranian, or 'Iranoid,' proper names. In the single Mitani letter, written by a Mitani king of the name of Dušratta to an Egyptian Pharaoh, there figures Dušratta himself, his brother Artāšuvāra, their father Sutarra, and their grandfather Artātama. The Mitani correspondence is part of the famous collection of tablets found in Tel-el-Amarna in Upper Egypt. The Mitani dynasty dates back to 1600 B.C.: we have therefore in these proper names the earliest recorded I.-E. word-forms. The existence at such a time of the West-Iranian stem *arta-* = Achemenidan *arta-* = Avestan *asa-* = Vedic *ṛta-* will tend to reduce the dislike to assume ancient dates for I.-E. texts like the Veda. The present writer, for his part, feels much more inclined to listen to the date 2000 B.C. (or earlier) after this discovery than before.

The language of the so-called Hatti, Hatians, or Hittites is found in inscriptions dating from the first half of the first millennium B.C. in Cilicia and Comagene, just at the bend where Syria passes into Asia Minor. These inscriptions are written in a mixed pictographic (ideographic), syllabic, and alphabetic writing of very obscure nature. That Hittite is Indo-European, a kind of prehistoric Armenian, is urged very vigorously and repeatedly by P. Jensen, the protagonist of these studies;<sup>1</sup> but careful critics like Winckler and Messerschmidt<sup>2</sup> do not agree with him. These studies are far from ripe; they are ripe enough to say that it seems more than unlikely that the Hittite is Indo-European. Certainly Jensen's most recent statement will appear to few as convincing as it seems to be to its author.

Cuneiform inscriptions in Assyrian and also in a non-Shemitic language, dating

<sup>1</sup> Recently, *Indogermanische Forschungen, Anzeiger*, Vol. XIV, p. 47 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See Winckler, *Der alte Orient*, Erster Jahrgang, 1900, p. 20.

from the ninth century B.C., show the existence in the land of Urartu, on the lake of Van in Armenia, of a pre-Armenian language. The name of this language is Chaldic, or Vannic<sup>1</sup>: it is neither Indo-European nor Shemitic. The presence of a non-I.-E. language in Armenia supports the theory that the Armenians were Europeans who migrated from the Thraco-Phrygian region into Armenia, subduing the allophylic natives. It also helps to clear the ground of Asia Minor, whose aboriginal inhabitants seem everywhere to have been neither Indo-Europeans nor Shemites.

The native languages of Asia Minor, especially the Lycian, of which the stele of Xanthos offers a connected specimen, were non-Indo-European.<sup>2</sup> Greek colonies on the one hand and early off-shoots from the Thraco-Phrygian stock, the Trojans, Phrygians, Bithynians, and Armenians, on the other, have brought Asia Minor under I.-E. influences at a very early time. The allophylic character of Asia Minor, to our mind, offers good reason to assume that the Indo-Europeans originated *somewhere in Europe*, and not *somewhere in Asia*, providing we include the Scythian steppes in the name Europe. If the spread of the Indo-Europeans had been from Asia to Europe the omission of contiguous Armenia and Asia Minor is hardly explainable; on the other hand, a gradual spread of nomadic Indo-Europeans from continental Europe through Scythia into the Aryan region could easily have passed around the water-hedged peninsula of Asia Minor. At a later time, a sea-faring time, Asia Minor was settled sporadically from Hellas and Thrace; then the Aegean Sea, Helle-spont, Propontis, and Bosphorus cemented rather than put apart the two peninsulas of the Balkans and Asia Minor.

Ancient Greece does not show a single trace of a non-Hellenic I.-E. language, leaving out of the question Macedonian, which seems to be an isolated Greek dialect.<sup>3</sup> The excavations at Mycenae, Tiryns, Crete, Troy, and various other parts of Greece, have brought to light a Pre-Hellenic civilization which precedes the literary age of Greece by many centuries.<sup>4</sup> A marked feature of this advanced civilization, rich in skilful architecture, plastic art, and treasures of gold, is the absence, in general, of inscribed monuments, or any other form of written records. With one notable exception: Crete has yielded engraved articles of pottery and stone and engraved gems with what is unquestionably some form of writing. The excavations at Knossos, on the northern shore of Crete, moreover, have unearthed formal wall inscriptions. The system, or perhaps systems, of writing seem to have been both pictographic (ideographic or hieroglyphic) and linear or syllabic. Not a single one of these inscriptions has been deciphered; all theories as to their nature and origin, whether they coquette with the idea of Hittite, Phoenician, or Egyptian sources, are mere guesses.

In the eastern part of Crete, in the neighborhood of the town of Praisos, the home of the so-called 'Eteo-Cretans,' two inscriptions in Greek character, but not in Greek speech, have been found of recent years.<sup>5</sup> Herodotus, vii, 170-171,

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, *JRAS.* XIV, 377 ff.; *A Primer of Assyriology*, p. 36; Winckler, *ibid.* p. 28; Hübschmann, *JF.* XVI, 200 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, p. 289 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Hatzidakis, *JF.* XI, 313 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age*, chaps. i and xi.

<sup>5</sup> See R. S. Conway. "The Pre-Hellenic Inscriptions of Praisos," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, No. VIII (1901-02), p. 125 ff.

states that Crete was depopulated by early migrations under Minos to Italy, and that 'in Crete, however, as the men of Praios report, after it had been stripped of inhabitants, settlements were made by various nations, but especially by Hellen.' These inscriptions, dating, perhaps, from 500-400 B.C., seem to show that the Eteo-Cretans nevertheless continued their speech into historic times. The scant material leaves the character of the language undefined; antecedently it is not unlikely that it is related to the indigenous languages of Asia Minor.

The isle of Lemnos, at the head of the Aegean, shares with Crete the distinction of harboring a trace of speech that is not Greek. This also is a record engraved in Greek character. In 1886 two French scholars, G. Cousin and F. Durbach,<sup>1</sup> discovered in the village of Kaminia a stone containing two inscriptions of somewhat similar content on two of its sides. The same French scholars noted at once certain resemblances with Etruscan; also the reports of Thucydides, Strabo, and Plutarch that Lemnos and Imbros were colonized by Tyrrhenians or Pelasgians, who dwelled there until the Athenian conquest, 510 B.C. Pauli, Bugge, and others also concluded that the Lemnos inscriptions are a form of Etruscan, or, as Pauli expresses it more precisely, 'The Lemnic Tyrrhenians are Viking-like pirates from Etruria.'<sup>2</sup> He is struck especially by the resemblance of the words  $\Sigma\text{I}\alpha\text{r}\Psi\text{F}\epsilon\text{I}\Sigma$ ,  $\Sigma\text{I}\alpha\text{r}\Psi\text{F}\text{I}\Sigma$  ( $\text{sial}\chi\text{veiz}$ ,  $\text{sial}\chi\text{viz}$ ) on each of the two inscriptions with the numeral  $\text{ceal}\chi\text{ls}$ ,  $\text{cial}\chi\text{us}$  of an Etruscan inscription on a mummy band in Agram, found by the Vienna Egyptologist, J. Krall. There is, to be sure, some doubt about the identity of  $\Psi$  with  $\chi$ , since the value of  $\Psi$  in the Aeolic alphabet is  $\psi$ , not  $\chi$ .<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless the relationship of the Lemnic with Etruscan is rather more probable than lies in the habit of such combinations.

The two most prominent tongues of land which the continents of Europe and Asia hold out towards one another, the Balkan peninsula and Asia Minor, contain the remnants of the most prominent of the minor I.-E. languages, the Thracio-Phrygian.<sup>4</sup> In the northeast of the Balkan peninsula, adjoining Macedonia, lies Thrace, a country inhabited from earliest times by I.-E. tribes. Perhaps as early as the third millennium B.C. there began a series of successive migrations into Asia Minor. The inhabitants of Troy in Homer's time were of Thracian origin and Thracian culture, immigrants from Europe who settled right at the door of Asia Minor. The Mysians to the north of Lydia in Asia Minor were Thracians, as also the Bithynians, and probably the Armenians. The most important migration from Thrace into Asia Minor is that of the Phrygians who occupy a large region east of the coastlands of Caria, Lydia, and Mysia. The Phrygians are the single one of the minor I.-E. peoples whose records, scant and broken as they are, suffice to lift their language out of the depths of profound obscurity.

Phrygia was the main locality of the orgiastic worship as a supreme divinity of the 'Great Mother,' Matar Kubile ( $\text{Kυβέλη}$ , Cybele), the same worship which was introduced into Greece about 500 B.C., into Rome about 200 B.C.<sup>5</sup> It is

<sup>1</sup> See *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, Tenth Year, January, 1886, p. 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Italische Forschungen*, II, 2, p. 225. <sup>3</sup> Solmsen, *KZ.* XXXIV, 41; Kretschmer, *ibid.*, p. 408.

<sup>4</sup> Fick, *Spracheinheit der Indogermanen Europas*, p. 417 ff.; Kretschmer, *ibid.*, chap. vii.

<sup>5</sup> See Showerman, "The Great Mother of the Gods," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*,



likely, however, that the worship of the Mother, as well as the characters associated with her : her lover Attis, his mother Kana, and her mythical attendants, the noisy Corybantes, were of Pre-Phrygian origin, somewhere in Asia Minor. From their native Thrace the Phrygians brought with them a god, Savazios (Σαυάζιος, Σαβάζιος), of uncertain origin and meaning. Another goddess, Zemelō, has been identified doubtfully with Σεμέλη, as the Thraco-Phrygian Goddess of Earth (cf. Old Bulg. *zemlja* 'earth,' Lat. *humus*, Gr. χαμαί). According to Hesychius, Βαγαῖος · Ζεὺς Φρύγιος μέγας πολλὸς ταχύς, they worshipped a supreme being under the special name Bagaïos. That this name is connected with Indo-Iranian Bhaga 'god of fortune or goodness' (Skt. Bhaga, Avestan Bagha, Achæmænian Baga) is quite certain. Torp's attempt<sup>1</sup> to explain Ζεὺς Βαγαῖος as an oak god, *quasi* Ζεὺς Φηγωναῖος, seems to me quite fanciful. Hesychius seems, moreover, to mean Iranians rather than Phrygians: in another gloss, Μαζεύς · ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Φρυγί, the god Mazeus (popular etymology upon Zeus) is surely Ahura Mazda, the chief god of the Iranians. Bagaïos is the Iranian Baga and nothing more.

Phrygian inscriptions are of two kinds, dating from periods possibly 1000 years apart. Old Phrygian,<sup>2</sup> dating perhaps from the sixth century B.C., is engraved on the so-called grave of Midas in the valley of Doganlu, and other rock monuments, about a dozen in number. Neo-Phrygian,<sup>3</sup> a kind of Pigeon-Greek, is exposed upon bilingual inscriptions from late Roman times. They are for the most part curses written upon tombs, both in Greek and Phrygian, and directed against possible violators of the grave: 'Whosoever does evil to this grave cursed be he,' *ios* (or *ios vi*, or *ai vi kos*) *σεμουν* (or *σεμου*) *κνουμανει κακουν* (or *κακων*, or *κακον*) *αδδακετ* (or *αββερετ*) *ετι τετικμενος ειτου* (or *ητου*, or *ητω*). In addition to the two Neo-Phrygian verbs *addaket* and *abberet* (*quasi afficit* and *offerit*) Old Phrygian contains the interesting verbs *edaes* and *egaes* (doubtful as to reading) to which may be a 1<sup>st</sup> decl., as a third, *estaes* on an inscription of Tyriaion.<sup>4</sup> They seem to be augmented preterites, doubtfully sigmatic aorists, from the I.-E. roots *dhē* 'set,' *gā* 'go,' and *stā* 'stand.' The space of an abstract forbids the closer analysis of the Thraco-Phrygian. So much, however, is clear: it is an independent I.-E. language, sharing certain qualities, as it should, with its neighbors in every direction. It is 'European' rather than 'Asiatic' in its vowel triad *e, o, a*: *ios*, *tekikmenos*, and the augment *ε*. It is a *satem*-language as appears from *semoun*, *semou*, plausibly identified with Old Bulg. *semŭ* from an I.-E. stem *ke-smo*.<sup>5</sup> The I.-E. voiced aspirates lose their aspiration: *-daket*: stem *dhēk*, and *-beret* from root *bher*. The most noteworthy point of contact with Greek, aside from loan-words, are the formation of the perf. middle participle in *-menos* (*tekikmenos*) and the declension of the Old Phrygian 'third declension' type, genitive *Akenolafos*, accusative *Akenolafan*.

The collective name Illyrian<sup>6</sup> is understood to refer to Indo-Europeans north-west of Greece and west of Thrace, *i.e.* to begin with, the ancient Illyrians them-

<sup>1</sup> *IF.* V, 193.

<sup>2</sup> Ramsay, *JRAS*, New Series, Vol. XV (1883), p. 120 ff.; *BB.* XIV, 309 ff.; Solmsen, *KZ.* XXXIV, 36 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Ramsay, *KZ.* XXVIII, 381 ff.; Hogarth, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XI, 158 ff.; Kretschmer, *WZKM.* XIII, 359 ff.; Torp, *BB.* XXVII, 280 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Torp, *ibid.* 288.

<sup>5</sup> Fick, *BB.* XIV, 50.

<sup>6</sup> Kretschmer, *ibid.* 244 ff.

selves. North of Illyricum dwelled the Istrians or Histrians on the small peninsula of Istria, and west of them, in Italy, the Venetians. Moreover, Illyric migrations across the Adriatic into Calabria are indicated by identical or similar proper names of places and persons on both sides of the Hadria. What is more important, in Calabria are found certain inscriptions, which are neither Greek nor Italic, but are ascribed to the Messapians or Japygians who came there from Illyria. The remnants of Illyrian speech are supposed to be the modern Albanian, a development of ancient speech in Illyria herself; the Venetian, and the Messapian. The character of Albanian is relatively clear, but its relation to Venetian and Messapian, as also the interrelation of all three, is far from clear. The 300 inscriptions, in round number, gathered in the ancient province of Venezia and adjacent districts contain all together but little material, and that of very uncertain character.<sup>1</sup> They contain the two parallel words *exo* and *mexo* which are generally rendered 'I' and 'me,' but may equally well mean respectively 'this' (nominative) and 'this' (accusative).<sup>2</sup> Especially noteworthy is a type of dedicatory inscriptions which state that some person 'has given me,' or, 'has given this' (*mexo zonasto*, or, *mexo zoto*) to some divinity, especially a goddess Rehtia (Rectia) whose name suggests a Goddess of Justice, a kind of *Θέμις* or *Δίκη*:

*mexo zonasto rehtiiah nerika lemetorina* = *me* (or *hoc*) *dedit Rectiae Nerica Lemetorina*. Another reads

<i>vhremahstna</i>	<i>zoto</i>	<i>rehtiiah</i> .
<i>Fremaxtina</i>	<i>dedit</i>	<i>Rectiae</i> .

The verb *zonasto* is explained as a sigmatic aorist middle third sing. from a verb = Lat. *donāre*; the verb *zoto* as a non-thematic 'second' aorist middle third sing. = Gr. *δδο*.

The phonetic indications of Venetian are scant and precarious. Owing to the uncertain meaning and etymology of *exo* and *mexo* it is impossible to say whether Venetian is a *satem*-language, as is Albanian, or a *centum*-language. But in one certain and important particular Venetian differs from the rest of the supposed Illyrian dialects: it treats I.-E. *o* as *o*, not as *a*: e.g. *zoto* with I.-E. ending *-to* = Gr. *-το*; or in the numerous nominatives and accusatives of the second declension like *Volttiomnos* (nom.) or *Ostiakon* (acc.). It is possible, though not certain, that Venetian is a North-Illyrian dialect, marked off pretty sharply from Albanian and Messapian, and inclining in its main characteristics toward the Italic languages. But there is, after all, very little but geographical vicinity, and a moderate correspondence with Messapian proper names. Perhaps it is not too much to say that but for these two facts, there is nothing to prevent the Venetian from being an independent I.-E. language.<sup>3</sup>

The Messapian inscriptions,<sup>4</sup> about 160 in number, are also mostly brief, and crowded with proper names. Two larger ones, one at Basta (Vaste), the other at Brundisium (Brindisi), are unfortunately of uncertain tradition and great

<sup>1</sup> See Pauli, "Die Veneter," *Altitalische Forschungen*, Vol. III.

<sup>2</sup> See Pedersen, *KZ.* XXXVI, 302 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Kretschmer, *l.c.*, 269 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Mommsen, *Die unteritalischen Dialecte*, p. 43 ff.; Bugge, *BB.* XVIII, 193 ff.; Kretschmer, *ibid.* 263 ff., 272 ff.

obscurity. The opening statement of the inscription of Basta, a kind of contract, is reconstructed and translated variously :—

*Klohi zis thotoria martapidogas tei basta veinan aran,*

‘Hear every one! Thotoria (daughter) of Martapidox sold to the town of Basta this field.’<sup>1</sup>

Or again,

*K'lohizis thotoria marta pido gastei basta veinan aran,*

‘Hear thou, Thotoria Marta made over to the town Basta her field.’<sup>2</sup>

Under such and other similar circumstances the character of the language is not easily established. The comparison of Messapian should be with Albanian, but Albanian is modern and mixed; Messapian, ancient, fragmentary, and corrupt. Direct lexical comparisons with either Albanian or Venetian words are practically wanting. The Messapian family name, genitive Barzidihi, is supposed to be derived from a stem *barza* = Alb. *barθ* ‘white’ (cf. Skt. root *bhrāj* ‘shine’). This would make Messapian a *satem*-language. The most important phonetic correspondence of Messapian and Albanian is the treatment of I.-E. *o* as *a*. The genitive sign of consonantal stems in Messapian is *as*, e.g. *kalatoras*, gen. of *kalator*, ‘herald.’ The stem vowel of I.-E. *o*-stems (sec. decl.) is *a* : nom. *Dazomas*, gen. *Dazimahi*; in this respect Messapian differs markedly from Venetian (above). All together the ties between Messapian and the other Illyrian languages are rather ethnological and geographical than linguistic. Its character, like that of Venetian, remains undetermined.

Passing from the Venetian across the Etruscan, which is certainly not Indo-European, we arrive at the last of the problematic I.-E. languages, the Ligurian.<sup>3</sup> In historical times the Ligurians were situated in the northwest of Italy in the province known to this day as Liguria. The stem *borm-*, clearly connected with the idea of warm springs, appears in the name of the town of Bormio (Bagni di Bormio) and other proper nouns. It is clearly derived from I.-E. *ghormo* ‘warm,’ in Skt. *gharma* ‘heat,’ Gr. *θερμός*, Lat. *formus*, Germ. *warm*, etc. The initial *b* of *borm-* marks the Ligurian as independent from the Celtic where the treatment is as *g*: Old Irish *gorim*, *guirim* ‘to heat’; Breton *gor* ‘burning.’ In 1890 two cemeteries containing inscriptions were discovered near the town of Ornavasso. The most important inscription is on a vase: LATUMARUI SAPSUTAIPE VINOM NASOM = *Latumari Sapsutaeque vinum Naxium*; it seems to contain a dedication of wine of Naxos to a deceased couple, Latumaros and Sapsuta, whose names are connected by the enclitic conjunction *pe* = I.-E. *qe*, Lat. *que*, Oscan-Umbrian *-p*, Greek *τε*, Sanskrit-Avestan *ca*. Furthermore, an epitaph found in the vicinity of the lake of Lugano,

*slaniai : verkalai : pala*

*tisui : pivotialui : pala*

<sup>1</sup> Deecke, *Rhein. Mus.* XL, 133 ff. Here *klohi*, ‘hear,’ is imperative sec. sing. = Vali *groši*; *zis* = Gr. *τις*; *tei veinan* = Lat. *dat venum*; and *aran*, accus. of *ara*, ‘field’ (cf. Lat. *arare*).

<sup>2</sup> Torp, *IF.* V, 195 ff. Here *klohizis*, ‘hear thou,’ is sec. sing. optative of a sigmatic aorist; *pido* ‘made over’ = Skt. *api-dat*, Gr. *\*ἐπι-δωτ*; *gastei*, ‘to the town,’ is emended to *vastei* (F for Γ); and *veinan*, ‘suam,’ is acc. sing. fem. from a stem *veina*, *\*sveina*, formed like Goth. *seina*, ‘suus.’

<sup>3</sup> Kretschmer, *KZ.* XXXVIII, 108 ff.

commemorates a husband and his wife : 'Of Slania Verkala the grave. Of Tisios Pivotalos the grave.' Kretschmer identifies *pala* plausibly with Celtic \**qalo* 'I dig,' in Old Irish *to-chlain* 'I dig,' Cymric *palu* 'fodere.' All three, stem *born-*, *pe*, and *pala* show that Ligurian is a *centum*-language.

Certain proper names of the Ornavasso inscriptions exhibit a close resemblance to Gallic (Celtic) proper names : *Latumaros* in its first part suggests *Latobrigi*, *Latobici*, etc. ; the second part *-maros* is one of the commonest elements in Gallic names. *Vasamos*, a name on another Ornavasso vase, suggests Gallic names in *Vass-*, like *Vassorix* and *Dagovassus*. But the treatment of the I.-E. labio-velar explosives as labials in *pe*, and especially in *born-*, shows of itself enough distinction between Ligurian and Celtic to admit the provisional conclusion that Ligurian is an independent I.-E. language, closest to Celtic, but yet not Celtic.

### 23. A Suggestion for a New Latin Dictionary, by Professor H. C. Elmer, of Cornell University.

The aim of this paper was to show that in a revision of such a work as Harper's Latin Dictionary, or some of our smaller general dictionaries intended for less advanced students, a vast amount of matter might be omitted altogether, not merely without detriment to any class of dictionary-users, but with decided and important gains to all. The treatment of the word *bibere* in Harper's Dictionary was used for purposes of illustration and examined in detail. As the paper appears in full in the *Classical Review* (April, 1905), I will content myself here with merely making an extract from it that will suffice to illustrate the general character of my criticisms. I select for this purpose that part of the paper that concerns itself with the treatment of such uses as those found, for instance, under I, 3 ( $\beta$ ) of Harper's Dictionary. Under this subdivision *bibere* is defined as meaning "arrive at," "come to." This is a good example of what seems to me to be one of the most serious faults of our Latin dictionaries, viz., their treatment of figurative expressions. It will do very well for the instructor of a class in rhetoric to analyze every rhetorical figure, and to point out the various methods by which rhetorical effects are produced. But such a method of procedure on the part of a Latin dictionary seems to me very unfortunate. I have frequently noticed in the course of my teaching that a student was losing all the charm and beauty of a passage solely because he had unfortunately consulted his dictionary, and the dictionary had deadened his susceptibility to the finer points of style. Let me give a few illustrations. If a student had learned from his dictionary merely that *bibere* means *to drink, drink of, drink in*, he would be prepared to translate each of the following passages in the manner indicated immediately after it : —

Verg. *E.* I, 62: Ante . . .

Aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim,

Quam nostro illius labatur pectore voltus.

*Sooner will the Parthian drink of the Arar, or Germany of the Tigris,  
than the countenance of that man be effaced from my heart.*

Verg. *Aen.* II, 803: Hasta . . .

. . . virgineumque alte bibit acta cruorem.

*The spear, driven home, drank deep of virgin blood.*

Mart. 1, 42, 5:

. . . ardentes avido bibit ore favillas.

*She drank in with greedy lips the fiery sparks.*

Hor. Od. 2, 13, 32:

Pugnas et exactos tyrannos

Densum umeris bibit aure volgus.

*The throng, pressing together shoulder to shoulder, drinks in with eager ear the accounts of battles and the banishing of tyrants.*

Verg. Aen. 1, 749:

Infelix Dido longum . . . bibebat amorem.

*The unhappy Dido drank in long draughts of love.*

In translating the *bibere* of these passages in the manner indicated, he would be doing full justice to the meaning and the style of his author. Is there any schoolboy who, in translating thus, would not at once catch the meaning and the spirit of each and every one of the passages? If there is, it would be only because his soul is dead and the study of language and literature is hopelessly beyond him. For the boy of ordinary intelligence such translations would breathe with life and vigor, would quicken his interest in the author he is studying and his appreciation of the poet's style. The boy would catch something of the real atmosphere surrounding the words. He would know, even before he was told, that such expressions are not to be found in ordinary prose styles. But if, in an unhappy moment, he notices that his dictionary treats of these very passages, he feels in duty bound, of course, to read what it says about them, and to profit by its suggestions. And he there finds these passages treated as follows: *Ante Ararim Parthus bibet* is translated *sooner will the Parthians "come to" Germany, etc.* (I, 3, β); *hasta virgineum bibit cruorem* is said to mean *the spear "drew" the virgin's blood, or "killed" the virgin* (I, 5, β); *avidu bibit ore favillas*, "*breathed in" the sparks with greedy mouth* (I, 6, α); *pugnas . . . bibit*, "*eagerly listens to" the accounts of battles* (I, 6, β); *bibebat amorem*, "*was affected with" love* (I, 6, β). When a student has read all that the dictionary says about such expressions, what has he accomplished? In the first place, he has wasted a considerable amount of valuable time, for he has been compelled to read very many lines of very fine print without reaping the slightest benefit therefrom. Worse than that, he has been lured away from all that places his author above prosaic common-place. And if, after being thus treated by the highest authority with which he is familiar, he still gets some appreciation of the grace and charm and the vigor of his author's style, it is only because he has something within him that can rise superior to his dictionary. I am inclined to believe that it would be a decided gain to omit all explanations and translations of purely figurative uses of a word, or at the very least to reduce them to the smallest possible compass. It may be objected that it is frequently difficult to tell when a word ceases to be felt as purely figurative in a certain connection and acquires an entirely different literal meaning. Very well—if it is uncertain whether in a certain connection a word is used figuratively or literally, certainly nothing whatever is gained by treating it in a dictionary as figurative. If the dictionary merely cited such

cases, without comment, there could be no possible loss to any one, and every reader would have a full and adequate appreciation of the word's meaning. When a word has clearly ceased to be felt literally and has acquired a distinctly different meaning, then, of course, the new meaning must be recognized and duly illustrated in the dictionary. But purely figurative uses, and even possibly figurative uses, may best be left to take care of themselves except in treatises on rhetoric and style. Full justice will be done them by merely citing them. If all the explanations and translations of the passages belonging to this class, which every one would be sure to understand perfectly without help, were omitted from the dictionary, there would be a saving of some twenty lines under *bibere*.

In my complete paper I attempt to show how a similar amount of space is wasted under other subdivisions of the treatment of *bibere* in Harper's and also in smaller dictionaries. This waste of space involves a similar and equally deplorable waste of time, energy, and money on the part not only of the students who use the books, but on the part of authors and publishers as well. The makers of our dictionaries of the various grades should consider more carefully the needs of the various classes of people for whom their works are intended. It seems to me that the faults I have pointed out are very serious faults, and of far-reaching consequences to the welfare of classical studies among us. In spite of the increase of late in the number of pupils engaged in the study of Latin in our schools, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the study of the classics is in a sense upon the defensive. The objection that is most frequently and most forcibly urged is that the time required to accomplish anything with the classics is altogether out of proportion to the results attained. It is in recognition of the force of this objection that men have rushed to the front with no end of "easy methods" and "short cuts" — with what lamentable results, we all know too well. We may as well recognize at the outset that there is no easy method of learning the classical languages. To gain anything like a fair mastery of Latin or Greek must ever require years of concentrated study. But this is the best of reasons why, in preparing aids for the students, one should not increase their inevitable burden. I am fully persuaded that a classical student is often compelled to sacrifice unnecessarily a vast amount of valuable time and energy because he has not the right sort of tools with which to work. What seems to me to be imperatively needed all along the line of his classical studies is the elimination of non-essentials, and the elevation of essentials into greater prominence, a more thorough grounding in general principles and less memorizing of divisions and subdivisions and of apparently isolated rules and facts, a more skilful and logical grouping of everything possible about a common centre with a view to aiding the memory by a closer association of related ideas. I have attempted in the paper from which this extract is made to indicate in the most general way how such a reform might be carried out in our Latin dictionaries, not only without loss, but with a positive gain, to the student in his appreciation of the language and literature, and in the interest and enthusiasm with which he pursues his study. For it seems to me that, with his present dictionaries, he is often compelled to work his way through thickets where he might be led through groves.

The paper was discussed by Professors Lanman, J. H. Wright, Slaughter, and F. G. Moore.

24. The *Accentus* of the Ancient Latin Grammarians, by Dr. C. W. L. Johnson, of Baltimore, Md. (read by title).

This contribution appears in full in the TRANSACTIONS.

25. Contributions to the Study of *Suppletivwesen*, by Dr. Mary C. Welles, of Newington, Conn. (read by title).

A. In the works of the Latin grammarians the phenomenon of composite inflection or "*Suppletivwesen*" attracts general attention, the obvious cases of it are noted, and some unscientific attempts are made to explain it by the principles of authority, usage, euphony, and difference.

Probus distinguishes between fusion of inflected endings as illustrated by *mula*, *mulabus*, and fusion by substitution as illustrated by *Iuppiter*, *Iovis*, and adds that such irregularities run through all the parts of speech. (Keil, IV, 48.)

Its extent is appreciated by Priscian alone, who groups together as kindred phenomena instances of it in the different parts of speech. He places in the same category:—

1. *Iuppiter*, *Iovis*, *iter*, *itineris*, *femur*, *feminis*, *supellex*, *supellectilis*, *hospes*, *hospita*, *gracilis*, *gracila*.
2. *ego*, *mei*, *quis*, *quae*, *quod*, *alius* -a -ud, *ipse* -a -um.
3. *fero*, *tuli*, *volo*, *vis*, *vult*, *edo*, *es*, *est*, *sum*, *eram*, *ero*, and *sum*, *fui*.
4. *bonus*, *melior*, *optimus*.
5. masculine and feminine pairs of words, as *eg.*: *pater*, *mater*, *frater*, *soror*, *patruus*, *amita*, *avunculus*, *matertera* (K. II, 418, III, 413, 415).

He calls attention to the irregular derivation of the numeral adjectives and adverbs; *unus*, *primus*, *singuli*, *semel*, *duo*, *secundus*, *bini*, *bis* (K. III, 413, 415), though he fails to form definitely these two groups, as Osthoff does (*vom Suppletivwesen d. indog. Spr.* 1899), and to associate *unus*, *primus* with *fero*, *tuli*, etc.

The following instances of composite inflection are given by the grammarians in addition to those just mentioned:—

I. Of nouns: *fidicen*, *fidicinis*, *fidicinae*, *jecur*, *jecoris*, *jecineris*, *pecus*, *pecudis*, *pecoris*, *penus*, *peni*, *penoris*, *semis*, *semissis*, *senex*, *senis*, *tibicen*, *tibicinis*, *tibicinae* (Charisius, K. I, 83, 134, Prisc. K. II, 229, 279); the feminine nouns which take the ending -*abus* *differentiae causa*, *nata*, *filia*, *dea*, *equa*, *mula*, *liberta*, *asina* (Prisc. K. II, 293).

II. Of pronouns: *ego*, *tu*, *ille* (Sergius, K. IV, 546); *ego*, *mei*, *nos* (Prisc. K. III, 144-145); those which take the genitive in -*ius* and dative in -*i* (Prisc. K. III, 5); the relative, interrogative, and indefinite pronouns, which form the dative and ablative, *quibus* (Char. K. I, 158-159).

III. Of adjectives: *ambo* and *duo*, which form *ambabus* and *duabus* by analogy with *deabus*, etc. (Prisc. K. II, 294); *duo*, which forms *duum* for *duorum* in the neuter *differentiae causa* (Prisc. K. II, 310); *malus*, *peior*, *pessimus*; *magnus*, *maior*, *maximus*; *parvus*, *minor*, *minimus*; *senior*, *magis* *anus* (Cledonius, K. V, 38, Pompeius, K. V, 153); cases of the substitution of one grade for another in phrases: *Juno sancta dearum*, *Juno magna dearum*, in which the positive is a

superlative in force (Donatus, K. IV, 390); Juppiter optimus maximus, in which the superlative is a positive in force (Donatus, K. IV, 375. See also I, 325, V, 39, 158, 342).

IV. Of verbs: 1) those in which forms from different roots are grouped into one system: arguor, convictus sum; facio, fio; ferio, percussi, ictus; fero, tuli, latum; furis, insanisti; medeor, medicatus sum; reminiscor, recordatus sum; sideo, sedi; sum, fui; vescor, pastus sum (Char. K. I, 249, 380).

2) those in which active and deponent are combined, called *neutro-passiva* by Priscian (K. II, 566): audeo, fido, gaudeo, soleo, and fio, factus sum.

3) those in which a periphrastic form supplies the place of an inflected form: angor, anxius sum; memini, memorem futurum; meto, messem feci, messus; novi, notum habuerim, notum habiturum esse, notum habiturus.

4) those in which a prepositional compound supplies the place of a simple form: odi, exosus, perosus (Servius, K. IV, 440-441, Char. K. I, 257); tollo, sustuli, sublatum.

5) those in which there is a fusion of two conjugations: sono, sonare, sonui (Eutyches, K. V, 386, Prisc. K. II, 445, 571); nexo (Prisc. K. II, 409); mico (*ib.* 472); plico (*ib.* 473); meo (Char. K. I, 245, 262, Diom. K. I, 369); similar verbs whose parts are given without comment.

The fact is observed that sometimes forms which the simple verb has lost are retained in prepositional compounds: absens, praesens, abiens, praeteriens, exosus, perosus (Prisc. K. II, 435); -fendo, -fragor, -perio, -pleo, -specio, which occur only in composition (Consen. K. V, 379); and that in some cases the lost form has been supplanted by an analogical formation or a form from another inflected system: *applicui*, etc., but *duplicavi*, etc. (Prisc. K. II, 469, 473); *conficior*, etc., but *adsuefio*, etc. (Char. K. I, 248, 251; Diom. K. I, 358; Prisc. K. II, 377, 398, 401, 402, III, 269); perf. *sevi*, but *-serui* in prepositional compounds (Prisc. K. II, 532).

V. Masculine and feminine pairs of words: puer, puella (Prisc. K. II, 231, 232); senex, anus (Probus, K. IV, 61).

VI. Composite groups of phrases: pondo duo, tria, etc., but una libra, etc. (Char. K. I, 35); miramur opera, admiramur virtutes (Agroecius, K. VII, 116); vir ducit, mulier nubit (Beda, K. VII, 281); stipulor abs te and quaero abs te for interrogo te (Prisc. K. III, 275).

B. A reading of the text of Plautus brought to light the following composite groups:—

I. The composite verb: fio, factus sum, futurus.<sup>1</sup>

Priscian gives three participles to *fio*: fiens, factus, futurus (K. II, 566), and Charisius three future infinitives: fiendum esse, factum iri, futurum esse (K. I, 251). That *futurum* supplied the place of a future participle to *fio* is confirmed by the following group of sentences from Plautus, in which *futurum* (or *fore*) is used parallel with some form of *fio*:—

*Fit quod futurum dixi. Cas. 788.*

*Quae futura et quae facta eloquar. Am. 1133.*

*Quod certe scio nec fore nec Fortunam id situram fieri. Poen. 624.*

<sup>1</sup> Gildersleeve-Lodge, *Lat. Gram.* p. 119, quotes *futurum esse* as the infin. of *fio*, which has not heretofore been proved; also *factum fore*, which is still to be proved.



Quo id sim *facturus* pacto, nil etiam scio,  
Nisi quia *futurumst*. *Ps.* 567.

Me.) (Auctionem) *fore* quidem die septimi.

Mes.) Auctio *fiat* . . . mane sane septimi. *Men.* 1156-7.

Sed quid *futurumst*, quom hoc senex resciverit ?

Quom se excucurrisset illuc frustra sciverit

Nosque aurum abusos, quid mihi *fiat* postea ? *Ps.* 358.

Pa.) Atque huius uxorem tu volo adsimulare. *Ac.*) *Fiet*.

Pa.) Quasi militi animum adieceris simulare. *Ac.*) Sic *futurumst*. *Miles*, 908-9.

Again, *futurum* is used with the dative of the indirect object, and in this construction is to be associated with *feri*, not *esse*.

Quid illis *futurumst* ceteris, qui te amant ? (*Mos.* 331) is to be compared with *Si sic aliis moechis fiat* (*Mil.* 1436), and

Reliquit deseruitque me : tibi idem *futurum* credo (*Mos.* 202) is parallel with *Quod . . . ceteris omnibus factumst* <sup>1</sup> (*Poen.* 1183 ; cf. *Truc.* 418, 633).

II. The composite group : act. *sino*, pass. *licet*.

The verb regularly used in the active in the sense of 'permit' in Plautus is *sino* : —

Immo neque habebis neque sinam. *Bac.* 145.

*Pator* occurs, but always with the accessory idea of sufferance, as e.g. : *As.* 240, 738, 739, 810 ; *Aul.* 88 ; *Bac.* 1191 ; *Cis.* 500 ; *Ep.* 148 ; *Mil.* 395 ; *Poen.* 368, 965.

*Permitto* occurs, but in the sense of 'yield' : —

Ut eam illi permittat. *Cas.* 270.

Tibi permittimus. *Curc.* 703. Cf. *Cas.* 394.

The regular and only passive of *sino* is some form of *licet* : <sup>2</sup> —

Ab eo licebit quamvis subito sumere. *Bac.* 339.

The perfect passive of *sino* occurs, but in the sense of 'be placed,' and has become a synonym of *esse* : —

Res omnis in incerto sitast. *Cap.* 536.

Ego, quoi libertas in mundo sitast. *Ep.* 618.

Quoi cor modeste situmst. *Men.* 971.

Cf. *Aul.* 609, 615 ; *Bac.* 178, 179 ; *Mil.* 1156 ; *Poen.* 342, 625, 1178 ; *St.* 53, 62.

Two phrases which occur in Plautus should be mentioned, one a synonym of *sino* and the other of *licet*, which stand therefore in the relation of active and passive to each other and to these verbs : —

veniam dedit. *Bac.* 532.

habent licentiam. *Tri.* 1034.

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *de Orat.* ii, 113 : Quid fiat, factum, futurumve sit ; Caes. *B.G.* iv, 6, 2 : ea, quae fore suspicatus erat, facta cognovit.

<sup>2</sup> On meanings of *licet*, see Emory B. Lease, "Zur Konstruktion von *licet*," *Archiv f. lat. Lex. und Gram.* XI (1898-1900), p. 9.

III. *Dico* and its synonyms *loquor*, *aio*, *inquam*.

The following sentences illustrate the degree to which these verbs have become synonymous : —

- Sic est ut loquor. *Bac.* 468.  
 Sicut dicis. *Aul.* 294.  
 Bal.) Erus tuos? Har.) Ita dico.  
 Bal.) Miles? Har.) Ita loquor. *Ps.* 1152.  
 Ita vosmet aiebatis. *Cap.* 676.  
 Audin quae loquitur? *Bac.* 861.  
 Audis quae dico? *Am.* 977.  
 Audin quid ait? *Cap.* 592.  
 Loquere quis is est. *Bac.* 553.  
 Dic mihi quis tu's. *Bac.* 600.  
 Quidquid istaec de te loquitur. *Mil.* 1012.  
 Velim de me aliquid dixerit. *Poen.* 1206.  
 Str.) Pergin male loqui mihi?  
 Ast.) Quid tibi ego maledico? *Truc.* 265-6.

That they should be more exact synonyms than appears from the above illustrations is not necessary to this discussion.

The study of these four verbs produced the following results : —

*a*) In comparisons, only *loquor* is used in the first person, and only *dico* in the second person; always *ut loquor*, but always *ut dicis*. This may be due to the frequent use of *loquere* as an imperative.

*b*) In the imperative: *dic igitur* is a stock phrase; *loquere* both when joined with *porro* and often when alone means 'speak on.'

Br.) Sine me dicere . . . Am.) Loquere. *Am.* 1090. Cf. *Aul.* 820, *Bac.* 739, *Truc.* 796, 799.

Quid fit deinde? porro loquere. *Am.* 1119. Cf. *Bac.* 745, *Merc.* 199, 615.

When Plautus wished to use *dico* in this sense, he substituted for the simple imperative a phrase : —

Perge dicere. *Cis.* 517, 751. Perge porro dicere. *Cis.* 754, *Tri.* 777.

*Inque* and *inquito* express no distinction in time, but are used alike always of the immediate future, "Say now." *Dicito* is always used of the more distant future : —

'Ita di faxint' inquito. *Aul.* 788. Cf. *Tri.* 427; *Rud.* 1342; *Bac.* 883; *Ps.* 538. Ubi tu lepide voles esse tibi, mea rosa, mihi dicito 'Dato qui bene sit.' *Bac.* 83.

Cf. *Aul.* 94, 97; *Bac.* 228; *Cap.* 395, 401.

*c*) *Aio* alone is used in exclamatory questions; *dico* and *loquor* always in questions which receive an answer.

*d*) *Inquam* alone is used in parenthesis with quotations.

The following typical sentences illustrate the way in which these verbs have differentiated in usage : —

Decies dixi : domi ego sum, inquam. *Am.* 577.

'Ita di faxint' inquito. *Aul.* 788.

Tum aquam aufugisse dicito, siquis petet. *Aul.* 94.  
 Quid ais tu ?  
 Dic igitur.  
 Loquere porro.  
 Ut loquor.  
 Ut dicis.

IV. The composite question and answer, Quid agis ? Valeo.

As a greeting, *quid agis* is a synonym of *ut vales* : —

Phr.) Quid agis ? ut vales ? Co.) Valeo. *Truc.* 577.

Both greetings may be put into the passive : —

Quid agitur, Sagaristio ? ut valetur ? *Per.* 309.

It is frequently unanswered, but may receive a direct reply : —

Di.) Quid agis ? Ast.) Valeo et validum teneo. *Truc.* 126.

Pa.) Salveto : quid agis ? Ca.) Vivo. *Curc.* 235.

Ly.) Quid agis, mea salus ? Ol.) Esurio, hercle, atque adeo hau salubriter.  
*Cas.* 801.

The same idiom occurs in the third person : —

Ep.) Quid (agit) erilis noster filius ?

Th.) Valet pugilice atque athleticce. *Ep.* 20.

Ca.) Tua uxor quid agit ? Me.) Immortalis est. *Tri.* 55.

The verb *ago* in its literal use does not occur as a reply. It is found once in an idiomatic expression : —

Tr.) Salve, Ampelisca : quid agis tu ?

Am.) Aetatem haud malam male (ago). *Rud.* 336-7.

And once *quid agis* (= *ut vales*) is purposely understood as *quid agis* (= *quid facis*) and answered in this vein : —

Str.) Quid agis, mea commoditas ?

Ep.) Quod miser (agit). *Ep.* 614.

V. Instances of composite inflection in nouns appear to be rare in Plautus. Two obvious cases occur : —

a) Sing. aedes, aedium, a house.

Plu. aedificia, houses.

b) Sing. aedes, aedis, a temple (= fanum).

Plu. aedes sacrae, temples (= fana).

The plural *aedificia*, houses, occurs but once : —

Haec argumenta ego aedificiis dixi : nunc etiam volo

Dicere, ut hominis aedium esse similis arbitremini. *Mos.* 118-119.

The noun *templum* in the meaning of temple does not occur in Plautus. Two synonyms appear to have been in common use, *aedes* and *fanum* : —

ego in aedem Veneris eo. *Poen.* 190. Cf. *Curc.* 481; *Bac.* 312.

In the *Rudens*, *fanum* is used with the same meaning: —

In *fanum Veneris*. *Rud.* 128. Cf. *Curc.* 204.

The plural *fana* is twice used: —

Heus tu, qui *fana ventris causa circumis*. *Rud.* 140. Cf. *Rud.* 821.

In the same sense we find *aedes sacrae*: —

apud omnis aedis sacras  
Sum defessus quaeritando. *Am.* 1013.

26. Critical Note on *προθέουσι*, *Iliad* I, 291, by Professor H. C. Tolman, of Vanderbilt University (read by title).

Line 291 remains a *locus desperatissimus* as it did in antiquity, for all difficulties connected with *προθέουσι* have never been explained away. The well-known theory (which is as old as Aristarchus) that the verb is the simple *προθέω* "run" forces us to account for the bold personification of *δνειδεα*. Shall we say "disgraceful words (like warriors) rush forth to his lips"? If so, we are bound to feel that the natural word which the poet would use for such hasty utterance is *προρέω* (cf. i, 249, τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέειν αὐδῆ). Furthermore this interpretation gives to *μυθήσασθαι* a harsh construction; yet I don't accept Schöll's view that it is an impossible one. Even Döderlein's attempt to make the infinitive dependent on *δνειδεα* in the sense of the adjective *δνειδεα* (*dictu contumeliosa*) would give a construction not a bit more violent than the Aeschylean *θραύματ' ἐμοὶ κλύειν* (*Agam.* 1166), which is regarded by most critics as the sound reading.

The more common theory that *προθέουσι* is for *προτιθέασι* must, of course, involve the loss of all reduplication in the transfer of the verb from the unthematic to the thematic conjugation, thus giving us a form absolutely unique.

Even in the Indo-Iranian languages reduplicated forms of this same root (I.-E. DHE) are retained when the verb has become thematic (cf. Sanskrit *dadh-a-ti*, Avestan *dap-a-ti*). Freytag's conjecture that we read *προθέωσι* for *προθέοσι* would avoid this difficulty, while the subjunctive might with some degree of plausibility be regarded as a dubitative subjunctive with implied negation, "Can it be that the gods would permit," etc., yet the justification of the meaning "permit" (*freistellen*, Voss) presents a serious problem. It seems impossible to reconcile such meaning with the ordinary signification of the verb, especially when we compare i, 178, εἰ μάλα καρτερὸς ἔσσι, θεὸς που σοὶ τὸ γ' ἔδωκεν. Bergk, influenced by a gloss of Hesychius (*καίροθέουσιν· κρατοῦσιν· προτρέχουσιν*), restores *καὶ* for *οἱ*, and, as is well known, interprets *προθέουσι* as dative of the participle (*iis qui auctoritate potiores sunt*, cf. xxiii, 890, *προβέβηκας ἀπάντων*). This interpretation not only forces a foreign signification upon the word but gives certainly a colorless expression for the "king of men."

I suggest the emendation *προέχουσι* for *προθέουσι*, not a violent change palaeographically (certainly not so violent as *προΐεσιν* Heyne, *πῶλλ' ἔστιν* Bent., *εἰ γ' εἰῶσιν* Gent.). This form, which occurs uncontracted only once in the Homeric poems (*Od.* xii, 11), I would take as the dative of the participle with

the familiar interpretation as seen in *H. Hom. Cer.* 151, *δήμου τε προῦχουσιν*. Furthermore, we could understand an ellipsis of *ἐστὶ* in the line and translate "For this reason is it his right to speak contemptuous words to his chiefs?"

Such an interpretation, I believe, finds support from (1) Nicanor's remark (*ὑποστικτέον ἐπὶ τὸ αἰὲν ἔοντες, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ οὐκ εἶδεα μυθήσασθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐλλείπει, ὡς ᾤθησάν τινες*), which certainly shows that some supposed an ellipsis in the passage; (2) the interpretation of the Scholiast to B. L. (*ἄρα ὀφείλει διὰ τοῦτο ἅλλοις ὀνειδίζειν· καὶ κακῶς λέγειν ἡμᾶς τοὺς βασιλέας*), implying at least that by the word in question *βασιλέας* was understood; (3) the gloss of Hesychius (*καιροθέουσιν· κρατοῦσιν*), which favors a dative participle with the meaning of *κρατεῖν*, a word which actually occurs three lines above.

27. On the Date of Pliny's Governorship in Bithynia, by Professor Elmer Truesdell Merrill, of Wesleyan University (read by title).

The object of the paper was to prove that 109-111 A.D., rather than (as Mommsen thought) 111-113, was the date concerned. It is expected that the paper will be published in full elsewhere.

28. Studies in Latin Accent and Metric, by Professor Robert S. Radford, of Elmira College (read by title).

This article will be found in the TRANSACTIONS.

29. A Quantitative Difficulty in the New Metric, by Professor Edward B. Clapp, of the University of California (read by title).

The shortening of diphthongs and long vowels in hiatus is an Epic practice, and in later Greek poetry is consequently confined for the most part to dactyls. *E.g.*, in the extant remains of Greek melic poetry [some 8000 verses], shortening in hiatus occurs 352 times. According to the ordinary scansion 338 of these 352 instances of shortening appear in dactyls, five in tribrachs, four in cretics, while in dissyllabic feet there is no instance where text and scansion can be regarded as certain.

These facts are adduced as casting some doubt upon the substitution of  $\_ \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup$  for  $\_ > | \_ \cup \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \wedge$  in the Glyconic, which is characteristic of the new metric. This change of scansion involves the breaking up of many so-called "cyclic dactyls" into trochees and iambs, and, as a consequence, the frequent occurrence of shortening in hiatus in dissyllabic feet. This is so difficult to accept, in view of the facts mentioned above, that the present writer is inclined to query whether, after all, it is not probable that  $\_ \cup \cup$  in the Glyconic, and similar series, was felt by the poets as a dactyl, rather than as a trochee plus half an iamb. If it were not so felt, why should they resort so often to the characteristic dactylic shortening in hiatus under these circumstances?

This paper is printed in full in the *Classical Review* for October, 1904.

30. The Puteanus Group of Mss. of the Third Decade of Livy: A Revision of the Classification of  $\beta$  and  $\lambda$ , by Professor F. W. Shipley, of Washington University, St. Louis (read by title).

The President announced that in lieu of the customary Report from the Standing Committee on Spelling Reform, its Chairman, Professor F. A. March, had asked Mr. E. O. Vaile, editor of *Intelligence*, to make a statement to the society of what had been done in the National Educational Association in the interest of simplified spelling.

MR. VAILE:

The first practical step in this matter taken by the national organization of teachers was the adoption of a resolution in 1897 by the Department of Superintendence directing the secretary in publishing the PROCEEDINGS of the Department to adopt, until further instructed, such amended spellings as might be prescribed by the following committee: Dr. W. T. Harris, Commissioner of Education, Dr. F. Louis Soldan, Superintendent of Schools, St. Louis, Missouri, and Dr. T. M. Balliet, Superintendent of Schools, Springfield, Massachusetts. This committee designated the following amended spellings for the secretary to adopt: program, tho, altho, thoro, thorofare, thru, thruout, catalog, prolog, decalog, demagog, pedagog.

This action was approved by the Board of Directors, and made to apply to all matter issued by the N. E. A.; and these spellings have been regularly used since, excepting in a few papers in the PROCEEDINGS, the authors of which objected to the use of these new forms and were allowed to have their papers printed in the regular spelling. The adoption of these twelve shortened forms by the N. E. A. was followed by their adoption by a growing number of publications and advertisers.

In the meeting of the Department of Superintendence in 1901, another advance step was proposed in the shape of a resolution petitioning the Board of Directors of the N. E. A. (1) to appoint a commission of twenty eminent scholars and business men — they were named in the resolution, with their approval — to become a head to the movement, and (2) to give this commission \$1000 a year for five years, to be used by it according to its judgment in furthering the cause. This resolution brought on an animated debate, but it was defeated by a vote of 105 to 97, I believe.

In 1904 at the meeting of the Department of Superintendence in Atlanta, the same proposition was introduced, slightly modified, petitioning the Board of Directors to appoint a commission and appropriate for its use \$2000 a year for five years, providing that only as much of the appropriation should be given to the commission each year as should equal the amount of money raised for its use from other sources. These resolutions were passed by the superintendents by a majority of about four to one. This action was supplemented by a canvass of the entire N. E. A. active membership on the subject of the petition, with the result that 1545 active members signed the petition to the Board of Directors, while only 171 signed the petition in opposition.

The petition was duly presented to the Board of Directors at the late meeting (in St. Louis), who, according to the regular order in such matters, referred it for advice to the Committee on Investigations and Appropriations of the Council of Education. This committee, after considerable deliberation, thought it advisable to take expert advice on the subject, and so referred it to a special committee consisting of Professor Calvin Thomas, of Columbia University, Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan, President H. H. Seerley, of the Iowa State Normal School, Superintendent C. M. Jordan, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, with the President of the N. E. A. (Superintendent William H. Maxwell, New York City) chairman *ex officio*. This committee is to report to the president of the Council by June 1, 1905.

Here is where this movement rests at present, so far as the N. E. A. is concerned. The sentiment expressed in favor of having the N. E. A. provide an efficient business organization for wisely encouraging and directing this movement and of devoting a small portion of its large annual resources under wise safeguards, for the use of this committee, is so pronounced that strong confidence is felt that the course outlined in the petition of the Department of Superintendence to the Board of Directors will be approved by the committee to whom the matter has been referred, each member of it being on record as favoring moderate and reasonable steps in the interest of the movement. It is generally understood that if this committee of experts so reports, all further opposition to having the N. E. A. lend its moral and financial support to this cause will be withdrawn.

The Committee on the Time and Place of the Meeting in 1905, by Professor Elmer, Chairman, reported its inability to make a definite report, whether to hold the next meeting at Cornell University or at Dartmouth College. Professor Perry expressed a desire to have the next meeting at Columbia University in 1905, and moved that after the adjournment of the Association the Committee have the power to decide the place and time of the next meeting. Carried.

Professor J. H. Wright reported for the Committee on the Nomination of Officers, presenting the following list of officers for the ensuing year : —

*President*, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University.

*Vice-Presidents*, Professor Mortimer Lamson Earle, Columbia University.

Professor Elmer Truesdell Merrill, Wesleyan University.

*Secretary and Treasurer*, Professor Frank Gardner Moore, Dartmouth College.

*Executive Committee*, The above-named officers, and

Professor Charles E. Bennett, Cornell University.

Professor Edward B. Clapp, University of California.

Professor Francis A. March, Lafayette College.

Professor Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University.

Professor Paul Shorey, University of Chicago.

The report of the Committee was accepted, and the Secretary was directed to cast the ballot of the Association for the persons nominated.

Professor Wright's term of service as a member of the Standing Committee to Nominate Officers expiring in 1904, the President appointed Professor M. L. D'Ooge, of the University of Michigan, to serve for five years from 1904.

The present membership of the Committee is as follows : —

To serve for *one* year, Professor W. G. Hale, Chairman.

To serve for *two* years, Professor T. D. Seymour.

To serve for *three* years, Professor Samuel Hart.

To serve for *four* years, Professor M. W. Humphreys.

To serve for *five* years, Professor M. L. D'Ooge.

On motion of Professor Smyth the office of Assistant Secretary was created. Due notice to this effect was given by the Executive Committee at the last annual meeting (see PROCEEDINGS for 1903, p. xix). The Assistant Secretary is to assist the Secretary during the sessions of the Association, but is not to be a member of the Executive Committee.

Professor Smyth then reported for the Executive Committee that at the last meeting Dr. Scott had proposed the following resolution : —

*Resolved*, That the Executive Committee be requested to consider and to report at a future meeting of the Association, whether it is expedient to change the method of publishing the papers read before the Association; and whether, in particular, it is desirable to publish the papers, or those chosen for the purpose, each in a separate monograph with a separate title-page, but all bearing the name and sanction of the Association, and a serial number; and whether, if this be done, it is expedient to abolish the TRANSACTIONS as such and to reduce the PROCEEDINGS to a mere official record.

In accordance with the request of the proposer of the resolution, who desired that his argument in favor of the change be printed in brief in the next number of the PROCEEDINGS, the Executive Committee has decided to postpone consideration of the matter, and to report at the next meeting.

The argument presented by Dr. Scott is as follows : —

THE METHOD OF PUBLISHING THE PAPERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

From the beginning of the Association the papers have been published in two series, one called the Transactions, consisting of papers chosen for publication in full, and printed in large type; the other called the Proceedings,



consisting of abstracts of the other papers, in connection with the minutes of the meetings, and printed in small type.

The papers in the Transactions have been printed in an order determined each year according to the length or subject or importance of the papers, or to other considerations necessarily left to editorial discretion. The papers in the Proceedings have been printed, in abstract, in the order in which they were read, intermingled with the minutes.

It has been the custom to print off a number of separate copies of each paper for the use of the author. No separate copies are issued to other members. The separate copies are not provided with a separate title-page. They are not always so printed as to begin with a recto, as convenience of separate publication requires. This plan is possible only by happy accident or by adjustment involving some extra expense.

The Transactions and Proceedings together constitute two long miscellanies, in two principal sizes of type. They extend now over a period of thirty-five years. They contain many hundred papers on many hundred topics. These papers are not classified. They are indexed in one general index, not now covering the whole period, and in many annual indexes.

On adjacent shelves the members of the Association and other subscribers may possess many feet or many yards of other philological miscellanies, as the Publications of the Modern Language Association, the Journal of the American Oriental Society, the publications of the Archaeological Institute, the Transactions of the Philological Society of London, and an indefinite number of long sets of other philological transactions and journals. On other crowded stacks of stuffed shelves there are other "continuing series" of other scientific transactions and journals, taking up a great deal of space, and involving no small expense in the acquirement and care thereof.

All these miscellanies are to the owner or consulter confused heaps of material containing much that is to him of the highest interest and value, papers that he would gladly place on his shelves as independent books, and also much that may be of interest and value to others, but is not to him — papers that he does not understand, that he will never attempt to read, and that he would never buy as separate works. But he has no choice, either to pick out what he wants, or to place it with other matter on the same subject. The method of publication blocks his choice, checks his study, chills his interest.

This should not be so. No method of publication, indeed, no bibliographic device, will ever enable any one to attain learning without hard labor and long research. But it is the dictate of science that all unnecessary obstacles be removed. All the time devoted to learning should be productive of results, either in knowledge or in discipline.

The method of publishing scientific matter in the form of miscellaneous and insequent papers inseparably printed and bound together is not scientific. It originated in an unscientific age, out of accidental conditions. It was circumstances of place, expense, temporary convenience, literary amateurism, forced expediency, that determined the form of the early Transactions of the learned societies of Italy, France, and England. It is custom that continues what accident began.

The result is that there is an immense number of valuable papers, and what

should be recognized as valuable books, buried beyond easy reach and sight in great heaps of printed blocks. These heaps are, indeed, provided with labels, but the labels are vague and nearly futile. The title or label "Philosophical Transactions" or "Transactions of the American Philological Association" is only a very general indication of the matters contained in the blocks of paper so labelled. Considered as scientific classification or practical guidance, the information is too meagre. What is wanted is precise information. This requires close classification. The guiding title should be, not "Philosophical Transactions," not "Observations on Fishes," but "The Shad," "The Fishes of Ireland," "The Freshwater Fishes of County Cork"; not "The Transactions of the American Philological Association," but "The Greek Dialects," "The Ionic Dialect," "The Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect"—always the closest classification, the most definite direction, that is convenient.

That papers on such subjects are published or sanctioned by the Royal Society or the American Philological Association is a fact of interest and value in interpreting or judging the work, but it is a subordinate fact, to some extent a mere accident, and it is unscientific to make this accidental fact, in effect, the title of the paper, or what is worse, to make the name of the publishing society a blanket title for a score or a thousand of works whose real title is hidden from view.

The acquirement of learning is best subserved by an abundance of separate books, each one dealing squarely and in detail with one subject, and not printed or bound inseparably with books or papers on other subjects, or on remote branches of the same subject. That a book contains 400, or 40, or 20, or 4 pages, is a mere accident. If it deals with one subject, call it book or paper or pamphlet or what not, it is entitled to a separate existence, to go whithersoever the owner wills. If not actually separate, it should always be separable. If two works are very closely related, they may indeed be bound together, like the Siamese twins. The condition is inconvenient, but it may be tolerable. But diverse works should be twain, not twins. Think of the annoyance and mortification of a gentle Siamese who finds himself an inseparably ligatured twin with a Rough Rider or a Congo cannibal!

The general principle is, that except for temporary purposes and within a convenient minimum, it is unscientific to print or publish scientific works or any matter that constitutes a distinct item in the sum of knowledge, in any other than (*a*) a classified form, namely, either as a systematic treatise, or as a part of a dictionary or encyclopædia, where the perfectly known alphabetic classification is for the general convenience better than any logical classification; or (*b*) a classifiable form, namely, as an individual work, or as one of a series of individual works, not previously classified or ossified or hopelessly ankylized with other works by a printer or binder, and therefore left to the classification of the user, who may put it where it will best serve his purpose.

It may be said that the published Transactions and Proceedings of learned societies throughout the world have failed of a certain part, sometimes of half or three-fourths or nearly all, of their possible utility, because of difficulties due to their style, their bulk, their weight, their print, their cost, their rarity, their language, their unknownness, their inaccessibility, their indexlessness, or their method of publication. No one can compute how much farther science would have progressed by this time if in these respects the conductors of these societies had

used the best judgment of their period. It is clear that in many cases mere custom, vanity, indolence, ignorance, parsimony, timidity, and other unscientific qualities have determined or deteriorated the form and the contents of scientific publications.

Few of the difficulties mentioned exist in the case of the Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association. In style, in bulk, in weight, in size, in type, in print, they are models. In these and other respects open to choice they reflect the judgment, the taste, and the scholarship of the executive officers, and in particular of the eminent scholars who have borne the burden of editorship. The method of publication was not, and has not been, a matter of deliberate choice and preference. It was and is an inherited custom.

The custom is not followed by all societies. A number of scientific societies publish their papers separately. Publishing societies like the Early English Text Society keep their issues distinct, in several numbered series. The series are commonly catalogued and shelved together, but scientific librarians break up such series, and place the separate works with their subject. It is unreasonable to keep such works together merely because they were issued by the same publisher. No library would keep in one series all the works published by the Clarendon Press or by John Murray. No library should be compelled to keep in one series all the works published by the Early English Text Society or the American Philological Association.

To a housemaid it looks nice to see a long row of Transactions of the same height, the same thickness, and the same color, with the same gilded labels. To a user of books it is a melancholy sight. The slight difference of thickness, when there is any, is a redeeming feature. I once had occasion to send to the binder a set of the publications of the English Dialect Society. They came back bound as ordered; but I did not order him *not* to pad out the thinner volumes, so, with great intelligence and judgment he padded them all to a double or triple thickness, so as to produce an elegant housemaid uniformity, devoid of all distracting individuality.

For the reasons I have mentioned, and for others which will appear on a consideration of the matter, I offered the resolution looking to a change in the method of publishing the papers of the Association. Put into concrete form, subject to changes in detail after discussion, my suggestion is this:—

That the papers chosen for publication shall be issued in the present size of page and the same, or any chosen, size and style of print, each in a separate or separable pamphlet, with an independent title-page, or a separate title on the first page, with a stiff, colored, paper cover, bearing the same title. That the title shall begin with the actual title of the paper, followed by the name of the author, as in an independent pamphlet or book. That the author's name be followed by a fixed formula, showing that the paper is published by the American Philological Association, and that it was read at a session, place, and date stated. That this formula, which would be in effect the series-title (and should therefore not come first on the title-page), be followed by a serial number, and then by the usual imprint. That each paper contain also a complete list of all the papers of the Association read at the same session, and thus retain all the advantages of the present method of publication.

The principle of separate publication should be applied so far as possible to the papers now printed in the Proceedings. Some of these are in fact full papers, covering several pages. Such papers could be printed in a four-page or larger folder. Shorter papers could go together on another folder, and the official minutes on another. All could be issued together, bound in one pamphlet, but still separable by the user. This would reduce the necessary miscellany to a minimum. It cannot be wholly abolished, in respect to the Proceedings.

The papers could be sent to the members and subscribers in separate pieces but all in one package, or at intervals when they are ready. Members and subscribers who so desired might receive them bound. They would still be separable. The main point is, that the present inseparable order shall not forever remain the only one. Let the receiver have the power to place the papers where he will.

There are two objections to the proposed separate publication.

One objection is, the greater expense, caused by the separate printing and handling, and especially by the addition of a separate title-page and cover for each paper. This objection deserves consideration. It may be at present a serious one. The Secretary will be able to estimate the probable difference, and to state other objections related to this one. My belief is, that the added expense will not be great, and that it will be amply balanced by the added advantages. And the added expense could be met by assessing it upon the authors themselves, or by the sale of the separate papers to non-members, or of extra copies to members. The amount of such sales would probably exceed the present sales of the bound Transactions.

The other objection is, that many of the papers, as separately published, would be so thin (I refer of course to their physical dimensions) as to leave no room, if they were bound, for a title on the back edge. The statement is true, but it applies to all pamphlets, and I think that all scientific librarians agree in the opinion that pamphlets should be kept distinct, bound if possible, but each within its own covers. The conventional distinction between pamphlets and books is merely conventional, and can be abolished by any binder. It ought to be abolished as soon as the owner can meet the expense.

Other objections and apparent difficulties will occur to the mind, but they will not prove serious. The thing proposed can be done. It has been done by other societies. Indeed, I doubt whether any member of the Association, if the method of miscellany publication were a new one, proposed for adoption against an existing method of separate publication, would vote for miscellany publication. For he would say, the separate publication is better.

I wish to add that this proposition arose from my own experience in the consultation and management of large quantities of miscellaneous material in the form of scientific transactions and journals, and that it reflects an acquired sympathy with the efforts of practical librarians to bring within some control the ever-growing floods of miscellanies and polygraphs. The matter requires consideration. My object in these remarks is simply to open the discussion, with the hope that the Executive Committee will deem it worth while to report the matter to the Association in a way favorable to its further consideration and discussion.

If the Executive Committee and the Association are favorable to the proposition, they may deem this a fitting year to make the change. But I am inclined to think that the special circumstances of the present meeting, amid the pressure and distractions of a world's fair and crowding congresses, will make it inex-

pedient to do more than to state the case to the Association, call for a general expression of opinion, and then remand the matter to the Committee for a report next year.

But I think that there never will come a year in which it will be scientific to publish scientific matter in an unscientific way.

Professor Bloomfield then raised the question of the advisability of holding the regular annual session of the Association in the winter, instead of in the summer vacation. In the discussion that ensued remarks were made by Professors Lanman, Seymour, Smyth, Hale, D'Ooge, and F. G. Moore. At the request of Professor Bloomfield an informal ballot was taken on his motion that it was the sense of the members present that the annual meetings be held in the winter, with the following result: twenty-five in favor, five against the proposed change. After further discussion Professor Bloomfield moved that, by way of experiment, the next two meetings of the Association be held during Convocation Week in 1905 and 1906. Carried.

It was understood that, if practicable, a meeting should be arranged conjointly with the Archaeological Institute of America, or with the Modern Language Association.

Professor Perry moved the following vote of thanks, which was adopted unanimously by a rising vote:—

*Whereas*, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth has performed the arduous duties of the Secretaryship and Treasurership of the American Philological Association for the past fifteen years with singular devotion and success, be it

*Resolved*, That the hearty thanks of the Association be extended to Professor Smyth for his untiring and efficient services as its Secretary and Treasurer from 1889 to the present time.

Adjourned at 12.50 P.M.

In accordance with the resolution adopted upon motion of Professor Bloomfield the next meeting of the Association will be held during Convocation Week, 1905.

The place of the meeting having been left to the decision of a committee, that committee has reported in favor of accepting the invitation of Cornell University for a joint meeting with the Archaeological Institute of America, at the time above indicated.

## PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST.

---

The Fifth Annual Meeting was held at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art in San Francisco on December 28, 29, and 30, 1903.

SAN FRANCISCO, December 28, 1903.

The Association was called to order at 2.30 P.M. by the first Vice-president, Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California, the President, Professor A. T. Murray, of Leland Stanford Jr. University, being unable to attend the meeting.

The Secretary of the Association, Professor John E. Matzke, of Leland Stanford Jr. University, presented the following report :

1. The Executive Committee has elected the following new members of the Association :

Prof. W. F. Badè, Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal.  
Mr. C. Bransby, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Mr. B. H. Cerf, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Prof. M. S. Cummins, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal.  
Mr. L. J. Demeter, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Mr. H. B. Dewing, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Prof. A. Emerson, Affiliated Colleges of the University of California, San Francisco, Cal.  
Mr. W. M. Hart, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Miss Hodgkinson, Lowell High School, San Francisco, Cal.  
Mr. I. M. Linforth, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Mr. E. W. Martin, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.  
Mr. C. Paschall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Prof. T. F. Sanford, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Mr. M. J. Spinello, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.  
Prof. C. W. Wells, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Through transfer from the American Philological Association there has been added :

Dr. Charles J. O'Connor, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

2. Professor Matzke then presented his report as Treasurer of the Association for the year 1902-1903 :

RECEIPTS.	
Balance on hand, Dec. 28, 1902 . . . . .	\$51.90
Annual dues and Initiation fees . . . . .	205.00
	<hr/>
	\$256.90
EXPENDITURES.	
Sent to Prof. H. W. Smyth, June 16, 1903 . . . . .	\$209.80
Postage and Printing . . . . .	15.50
Incidentals . . . . .	1.50
	<hr/>
Total . . . . .	\$226.80
Balance on hand, Dec. 27, 1903 . . . . .	30.10
	<hr/>
	\$256.90

The President appointed the following committees :

*On Nomination of Officers for 1903-1904:* Professors Senger, Elmore, and Mr. Gleason.

*To Audit the Treasurer's Report:* Messrs. Mower, Cogswell, and Professor J. T. Allen.

*On Time and Place of Meeting in 1904:* Professors Cooper, Nutting, and Mr. James.

The reading and discussion of papers was then begun.

# 1. The Plural of Segolates, by Professor Max L. Margolis, of the University of California.

In the plural of Hebrew segolates (forms of the type *malak*-, etc.) we find a vowel (*a*) between the second and third radicals (e.g. *mālāk-īm*). Whence this *a* ? The following answers have been given: (1) The plural is derived from a parallel singular form: *mālāk-īm* from *malak*-. This statement is usually accompanied by the assumption that *malak*- itself goes back to *malak*-. So Luzzatto (*Prolegomeni*, 1836, 116 ff.; *Grammatica*, 1853, 358), Philippi (*BSS.*, 2 (1894), 373, 376 f.: the preservation of the *a* in the plural is put to the account of the accent of which it was the bearer; Philippi enumerates the traces of the *a* in the plural in the other Semitic dialects, as Aramaic *malāk-in* with spirantization, Arabic *'arad-ūna*, Ethiopic *kalab-āt*). (2) The Ethiopic and Arabic forms just quoted afford Praetorius (*BSS.*, 1 (1890), 374-377) the opportunity for a different explanation. Observing that the supernumerary vowel appears to be limited to the feminine plural, he concludes that it arose by conforming to the vowel in the singular, which is either an original or a helping vowel in front of the consonantal ending *-t*; then it spread into the masculine plural. In adjectives the supernumerary vowel is wanting, because of the analogical influence of the masculine. Praetorius' conception about the character of the consonantal suffix *-t* is certainly erroneous when applied to primitive Semitic speech. Lagarde (1884, 1889) derives *mālāk-īm* from *malak*-, which latter he considers to be a corruption of *malik*-. He is quite right about deriving certain *malak*- forms from *malik*-; but his explanation of the plural is not convincing. Stade (1879) speaks of the analogical influence of the plural of the *dāḥār-īm* type; but Ungnad (see below)

rightly asks for the cause inducing the analogy. (3) König (*Lehrgebäude*, 2 (1895), 408 ff.) and, in an improved form, Ungnad (*ZA.*, 17 (1903), 333-334) see in the supernumerary *a* a parasitic vowel the insertion of which is connected with accentual conditions. Ungnad misinterprets the dual *ḵərān-aiṃ* and (this is the vulnerable spot) explains the spirantization in *malḵ-ai* as due to the analogy of *mālāḵ-ai-nū* forms. (4) Nearer the truth, but a long way off yet, is Lambert (*REJ.*, 24 (1892), 104-106). He compares the Arabic broken plurals of the type *ḵ'al-* and *fu'al-*, and arrives at the conclusion that originally the plural of segolates was distinguished from the singular only by giving the characteristic vowel a different position. His explanation of *malḵ-ai* is phonetically impossible. (5) The explanation which I have made my own is that given by Salter Brooks, *Vestiges of the Broken Plural in Hebrew*, Dublin, 1883 (the pamphlet appears to be unknown in Germany). Brooks, it seems, was unaware of the fact that he had been anticipated by Ernst Meier, *Die Bildung und Bedeutung des Plural in den semit. und indogerman. Sprachen*, 1846. The German publication just referred to contains much that is confused; hence the oblivion to which it has been consigned. Nevertheless, it elicited the praise of Johannes Schmidt (see his *Pluralbildungen der indogerman. Neutra*, 1889, 10, footnote). Meier sees in the plural suffix *-im* an abstract suffix. Hence *zākūn-im* "old age," etc. But the abstract may be used for the concrete (comp. *Sult-ān*; hence *Elōh-im*, Deity, God). Abstract nouns become collectives, then plurals. He points to the broken plural of *malḵ-* forms (Hebrew, Arabic, Ethiopic). He knows of the plural of the plural: *raḡul-*, *riḡāl-*, *riḡāl-āt-*. Accordingly he explains *mālāḵ-im* on p. 78 as the plural of a plural. The shortening of the vowel is explained neither by Meier nor by Brooks. Here Barth's Law of Compensation (*Nominalbildung*, xiii.) steps in to furnish the wanting explanation. Barth unnecessarily confines himself to the feminine suffix; his law, however, holds good of any abstract suffix. Hence *mālāḵ-im* (nevertheless we find *'ilōh-im* without compensative shortening, cf. *'āḥōd-ā(h)*). Compensative forms are found also in Arabic (also in broken plurals). *Malḵ-ai* (with *a*) I explain as due to the analogical influence of the singular. The consonantal environment is another influence. Cf. *kanf-ai* by the side of *dibr-ai*. (Ultimately compensative shortening will be found to rest upon accentual conditions; perhaps some light will come from Grimme's forthcoming essay on the Semitic "ablaut.")

## 2. Concessive *Si*-Clauses in Plautus, by Professor H. C. Nutting, of the University of California.

In this paper a distinction is made between simple and intensive concessive clauses. The latter are characterized by intentional exaggeration, e.g. "Though *Jupiter himself* should come to your assistance." The usage of *si* and each of its compounds is examined from this point of view. The tables at the end show the peculiarity of the intensive type, with reference to both the introductory particle and the mood of the verb. A discussion of the reason for these peculiarities is appended.

The paper was discussed by Professors Clapp, Merrill, Elmore, and Fairclough.



3. The Subjunctive in the So-called Restrictive *Quod*-Clauses, by Professor J. Elmore, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

After discussing the views of this construction which are held by the grammarians, the paper sought first, with respect to the mode, to establish the actual usage of the language, many examples being brought to show that in every type of these so-called restrictive clauses both indicative and subjunctive are found. The reason for this modal behavior is to be looked for in the logical relation of the clauses to the sentences in which they stand. It was held that this logical function is to denote the special consideration (or considerations) in view of which a statement is made; that is, to constitute the mental point of view from which the speaker utters his thought. In this case the antecedent, of which these *quod*-clauses were originally an expansion, would be a demonstrative in the ablative case,—the so-called ablative of specification or respect,—by means of which the clauses would be closely connected with the rest of the sentence. The mode was determined by the relation existing between the antecedent and its clause. If the clause was felt as merely determinative, the indicative occurred; if, on the other hand, it was descriptive of the antecedent, there resulted naturally the subjunctive of characteristic. Each mode gave to the clause a special shade of meaning. After the mode had become established, we need not, of course, assume a definite consciousness in the speaker's mind of its origin. The modal coloring, however, was no less strong on this account.

This paper was discussed by Professors Nutting, Clapp, Fairclough, Noyes, and Merrill.

4. The Chinese Drama, by Professor John Fryer, of the University of California.

The Chinese drama has hitherto received but little critical attention from European and American students of the language, literature, and customs of the country. Hence by those who are strangers to China and the Chinese it has been inferred that the drama does not occupy a very conspicuous place in the general esteem of the *literati* and better classes of the people. Such, however, is not the case; but, on the contrary, it has been made one of the greatest and most popular means of enlightening the masses as to the important events in their national history, and of illustrating the great ethical principle laid down by the ancient Chinese sages, that "virtue is its own reward, while vice is its own punishment." Hence the drama has been fostered and promoted by some of the best of the officials and guardians of public morals in China, who have sought to elevate its tone by encouraging what is good in it, and eliminating what is evil.

I. ORIGIN OF THE CHINESE DRAMA.

Chinese history seems to point to about one thousand years before Christ as the date when dramatic plays were first dimly conceived of. This is about the time of Solomon, who had "multitudes of singing men and singing women," and whose elegant dramatic composition known as the *Song of Solomon* is supposed to have been written for his marriage-feast celebration.

The origin of the Chinese drama is usually traced to the Emperor Ming-Huang. The legend states that one of his three souls took a journey to the moon, which the Chinese believe to be inhabited. When he reached the Palace of Jadestone in the moon, where the ruler of that orb resides, he found the people were engaged in some theatrical performances to which he paid particular attention. On the soul's return to his body he remembered what he had seen, and started to produce the Chinese drama in imitation of it. He engaged several of his people to train themselves as performers. Being very fond of music, he established a sort of musical school, held in a pear orchard, where about three hundred people of both sexes were instructed and prepared for carrying on various kinds of amusements for the entertainment of the imperial court. There were instrumentalists, singers, and dancers or actors, who were known as "Youths of the Pear Orchard,"—a term still applied to all followers of the Thespian art. The exact nature of these performances is not very well known or understood. They probably partook considerably of the nature of the opera, or of the lyric drama, very much as the Greek tragedies did.

In recognition of the efforts of the Emperor Ming-Huang in starting the first school of performers, he has been canonized, and is still worshipped under another name as the patron god of play-acting. Hence, in the chests containing the accoutrements or properties of a troupe of players, there will always be found, on a larger or smaller scale, an image of their god of the theatre, which is superstitiously carried about with them wherever they go.

The drama as we now find it in China is evidently of foreign or Mongol-Tartar origin, and was introduced from that country when the Mongolian conquest of China took place and the Yuan dynasty was established. The "Hundred Plays of the Yuan Dynasty" have become as much the standard work on the subject of the drama as the plays of Shakespeare have with us. During that dynasty there were eighty-one authors of more or less note who had written separate plays to the total number of five hundred and sixty-four. These are all regarded as of a classical character.

Since the Mongol dynasty the Chinese drama has originated an immense amount of literature, in spite of all the imperial restrictions that have been imposed upon it, for it supplies a universal want. Hence every class of society in China has its own popular dramatic entertainments of a higher or a lower order.

## 2. THE ACTORS AND ARRANGEMENTS OF CHINESE THEATRES.

It is interesting to find that the Chinese drama has several points of similarity with that of the Greeks. In Greece the plays would commence at sunrise and continue all day until sunset, just as they do still in the open-air stages of the country districts in China. Women were not allowed to perform; there was no interval between the pieces; there was no curtain, no scenery, no prompter, and no attempt at realism. The words of the play were partly spoken and partly sung,—the quality of the voice of the actor being of the utmost importance. Before masks were invented, the Greek actor painted his face and wore shoes with very thick soles or "cothurns." These and other points of resemblance are all to be found in the better class of Chinese theatres of the present day.

A full company of actors consists of about sixty men, each of whom has com-

mitted to memory from one hundred to two hundred plays. There being no prompter, it is only an excellent memory that can retain so much. The actors are generally divided into five classes, according to the nature of the parts they have made a special study of.

Those who take the better class of women's parts have to wear imitation small feet, and have to sing or say their parts in a shrill falsetto that requires much practice to produce the best effects.

The songs and words are generally in the ancient Mandarin language, which differs entirely from the local dialects of different places, and is, of course, unintelligible to the masses. Hence the audience does not go to listen to the words, but to see and hear the skill of the actor.

The stage has only two doors,—one for entrance and one for exit. As the performers of one set leave the stage those of the next part enter by the other door, so that there is never a break in any performance or set of plays. What cannot be inferred from the more or less gorgeous clothing, or the movements of the actors, has to be told to the audience by the actor himself, who states whom he represents, what he has done, and what he has to do.

### 3. THE LITERATURE OF THE CHINESE DRAMA.

The Chinese divide their classical dramatic literature into three principal groups, according to the age when the plays were written. First come the earlier plays produced during the T'ang dynasty, or, roughly, between the years 720 and 960 A.D. Second, those dating from the Sung dynasty, or from 960 to 1127 A.D. Third, those written during the Yuan dynasty, or between 1127 and 1368 A.D. Since the Yuan dynasty, the number of plays that have been published is enormous, but they have never succeeded in supplanting those of the older classic times in the estimation of cultured Chinese.

Among the thousands of plays that might be mentioned, the pathetic drama in twenty-four acts entitled "Record of a Pi-pa" (or Chinese guitar) partakes as much of the nature of the novel as of the drama. The first representation of this affecting play took place at Peking in A.D. 1404 during the Ming dynasty. It is said that this masterpiece, which gives an account of the sad life of a talented singing girl, if performed by a highly trained troupe, not only brings tears to the eyes of the whole audience but even the actors themselves are so much affected as to be unable at times to continue their parts.

Modern plays are nearly all of the "*Wu*," or the military, kind. They pander too much to the popular demands for noisy display and fierce fightings, to say nothing of licentiousness. The "*Wen*," or civil, plays are usually of a much higher order, and certainly teach a better class of moral sentiments, but are little patronized even in the great cities.

A wealthy Chinese gentleman of a philanthropic turn of mind, named Liang-yu-chih, not long since attempted to reform the tone of the popular theatres by encouraging the performance of what may be called "morality plays," of which he published an original collection and sent me a copy, which suggested the writing of this paper. The title of one of these plays is "The Story of Grinding at the Mill," and it may be taken as a sample of the whole collection. The heroine is a young girl, the daughter of respectable parents of the poorer middle

class, who is betrothed to the son in another family, living at some distance. She is brought up in the future mother-in-law's house, as is sometimes the Chinese custom. Though treated in the most cruel manner, she meekly submits till the very gods are moved by her dutiful conduct to interfere on her behalf. Yet the mother-in-law is professedly a devout Buddhist. Her visits to temples to burn incense and pray to Buddha, as well as her invocations of Buddha's name, are introduced in the midst of all her cruelty in order to ridicule the followers of that religion. She makes the poor, half-starved child turn the heavy flour mill half the night and grind for the whole family, beating her every now and then for imaginary offences. Her gross hypocrisy when the mother of the child comes to visit her is only too true to the life. The play finishes by the mother-in-law being struck down by one of the gods and lying dangerously ill, when the girl cuts out a piece of her own flesh to make soup for her cruel tormentor, according to the popular belief that such means would insure recovery. Then comes the old lady's restoration to health, her knowledge of this piece of self-sacrifice, and her bitter repentance; while the dutiful conduct of the daughter-in-law is promulgated by official authority far and near.

The style of these twenty-seven plays is chiefly adapted to the common people, but they have the usual amount of poetry and songs, without which they could never hope for popularity. Even with these accompaniments, there is doubtless too much of the "goody-goody" element in them to make it at all likely they will ever please the vitiated taste of the general Chinese public enough to grow into much demand.

Adjourned at 4.30 P.M.

#### SECOND SESSION.

The second session was called to order at 8 P.M. by Professor E. B. Clapp, of the University of California.

In the place of the address scheduled to be given by Professor A. T. Murray, the Association listened to the following lecture:

5. The Etruscan Nekropolis of Abbadia del Fiume, near Pitigliano, by Dr. Alfred Emerson, of the University of California.

Abbadia del Fiume is an uninhabited hill on the west bank of the river Fiora, a little more than halfway from Orvieto to the seacoast. One leaden slingshot with the inscription STAT came to light among the ruins of a tricellar Etruscan temple which has been identified at the northern end of the hill. The document has been invoked in behalf of identifying Abbadia with the Roman Statonia. Signore Riccardo Mancinelli, an experienced explorer, whose headquarters are at Pitigliano, discovered and excavated the Etruscan cemetery and town-site, between 1895 and 1898. The locality was frequented at that period by a band of outlaws who had one of their safest refuges in the forest of Lamone, five miles across the river, and whose exploits were a recent memory when I visited this section of southern Tuscany in 1902. Seven complete tomb-outfits from Mancinelli's harvest of Etruscan antiquities on this spot were secured for the Phoebe

A. Hearst collections at the University of California, in July of that year. Other specimens have found their way to the *Museo etrusco* in Florence, and to the Royal Museum of Berlin. Pellegrini and Bochlau have reported upon them in the *Giornale degli scavi* (1896, 1898), and in the *Jahrbuch des deutschen archaologischen Instituts* for 1902. Mancinelli's plans of the principal tomb-types, and his careful records of the conditions in which the leading varieties and shapes of sepulchral earthenware occur in this cemetery, and in other Etruscan cemeteries explored by him, increase the value for science, both of the tombs and of their contents. A door is opened to a more exact chronology than experts have ordinarily attempted.

Lantern illustrations from drawings and photographs, made at Pitigliano, were presented. They showed the variety of tomb plans and sections, the probable evolution of sepulchral architecture, and the principal classes of pottery as found in the pit, trench, lateral recess, simple and multiple chamber-tombs of Abbadia del Fiume. A coincident progress can be traced in the variation of tomb designs, and in the occurrence of special types of earthenware in tombs of shifting plan. Members of the Association and visitors verified these general indications on the morrow of the lecture, by a personal inspection of seven tomb-units from Abbadia, in the State University's temporary Museum of Anthropology. The seven Abbadia tombs are lettered A to G. They comprise 430 exhibits, of which 366 are specimens of plain and of decorated earthenware. Iron and bronze weapons and other utensils constitute most of the remnant. There is a predominance of iron over bronze. Bronze belt-buckles, frequently adorned with heads of horses, more rarely with little dogs, bronze bracelets, fragments of bronze bits, spear-heads and spear-shoes, knives and plowmen's hoes of both metals accompanied the bodies of men. Lighter bracelets, bronze fibulae of the leech-bow shape (*fibule a sanguisuga*), other bronze pins, reinforcements for wooden-soled Tyrrhenian sandals made of both metals, accompanied the bodies of women. Wine-goblets of heroic proportions and armies of normal wine-cups were buried with the men, sets of conical spinwhorls, of cylindrical and clubbed weaving-spools, were buried with the women, to help the shades of the dead realize the missions of their sexes in Hades. They are of terra-cotta. The absence of precious metal, amber, and ivory, in the Abbadia tombs, and their scant wealth, even of bronze, persuade us that sumptuary laws forbade the burial of costly objects with the dead more severely there than they did in other Etruscan cities. It is true that many tombs were surely pillaged in the sixteenth century, when the hill of Abbadia got its alternative name of Poggio Buco.

In the trench and lateral recess tombs the dead were laid with their heads to the west. Antique worshippers of Greece and Italy normally faced the rising sun. The faces of the dead would turn easiest as their feet lay.

Only one cremation tomb was discovered at Abbadia. It is a round pit (*tomba a pozzo*), and contained a cinerary urn with the customary footless, one-eared drinking vessel of coarse gray ware for cover. One cup of this type occurs in our plain trench-tomb A. Tomb D, a trench with two lateral recesses, has one with a foot. But the older rite of inhumation held its ground triumphantly. Our tomb B was a large trench-tomb, with one lateral recess for the occupant's body. Thirty-seven drinking vessels found in it include no example of the urn-like type. Earless goblets of a finer gray ware, handsome gadrooned cups of

black composition with loop handles have taken its place. Earthenware stands accompany the gadrooned vessels. A little tumbler (*poculum*) of uncolored and unpolished clay is the earliest type of wine-cup in this tomb. Signore Mancinelli tells me he has found tumblers of this sort in Etruscan graves of every period, in Roman graves of the Republican and Imperial periods, in Christian graves of late Roman and of Lombard periods. Plain forms often survive advances of technique and changes of fashion and faith better than the ornate do. The early gray and *flambé* earthenware, polished by hand, — hardly sized with wax, as Bochlau supposes, — will presently develop, by gradual stages, into the so-called Etruscan *bucchero* pottery of finer composition and blacker hue. The uniform red firing of some pieces (*rosso rame*) was a development, like the uniform smoked blacks, of the earlier *flambés*. Prehistoric earthenware in Phrygian mounds, and the predynastic potteries of Egypt, offer examples of the same accidental effects followed by intentional bichrome and monochrome firings black and red.

The dominant class of pottery in the recessed and unrecessed trench-tombs, after the *buccheri italici*, is the indigenous imitation, interspersed with imported specimens, of the painted geometric patterns of prehistoric Greece. Is it true that these rectilinear patterns succeeded the earlier profusion of animal and floral and spiral motives, and to the richer ceramic palette of the Mycenaean styles, coincidentally with the Dorian invasion's overthrow of Achæan dynasties in the Peloponnesus? If so, we can assign the early popularity of Greek geometric potteries in Etruria, and the first reproductions of these Greek models by native kilns, to about 1000 B.C. Montelius has proposed an earlier, Bochlau a later date. Certain distinctly Etruscan amphibia, as painted on geometric ware from other Etruscan tombs, persuade me to describe most of the geometric make from Abbadia as native manufacture of perceptibly later period. An exquisite pink and orange skyphos with a trellis of delicate parallel lines, in Tomb B, is a manifest Greek importation. It is the counterpart of a specimen which Schliemann found in the ruins of Tiryns.

Broad and narrow horizontal stripes of black, brown, red, and purple alternate with friezes of straight and waved verticals, and of cross-hatched lozenges, on the coarser geometric ware. The vertical bars recall the triglyphs and metopes of a Doric frieze, by their alternate crowdings and blanks. The ground is oftenest the pink or yellow body of the clay. Some grounds are creamy white and pale buff.

Purely native patterns include two striking varieties. Small bowls and amphoras of brown clay, and of bulbous shapes, often show regularly distributed bars, squares, and triangles, and rectilinear decorations of opaque white. A close examination proves it to be oxide of lead. A still closer scrutiny discovers that the crocks were plated with laminae of metallic lead. Distributions of tiny, cup-like impressions served to hold the leaden plates tighter in place. Many big jars and a few drinking vessels of the same period wear singular patterns in applied relief. Vertical and horizontal bands alternate with systems of horseshoe ridges. These overarch the handles. Rams' heads and plainer protuberances, midway between the handles, are similarly arched, and appear to be a reminiscence of spouts. Paired and multiplied nipples recall the humanized jars and pitchers of Troy and Thera.

The geometric styles did not long survive the substitution of sepulchral chambers

for open trench-tombs. The native smoked ware of smooth finish did. Painted Corinthian pitchers, with round bellies and trilobate mouths, flat plates, low, bulbous cups with horizontal handles, globular and alabastroid flasks, superseded the Tuscan imitations of Greek geometric ware. The Corinthian polychrome effects, in buff, brown, black, purple, and white, the Greek style's painted processions of panthers and geese across flowered fields, contrast strangely, in the chamber-tombs, with the Etruscan potter's crude incised drawings of birds and fishes, on dark gray amphoras of silicious *bucchero*. Native imitations of the Corinthian forms in ivory-white clay remain rare enough to be classed as a tradesmanly experiment. A pearl-gray monochrome ware appears to resist the encroachment of the shiny black pottery for a moment. The black *bucchero* that is found in the tricameral tombs presently assimilates the Corinthian shapes. These shapes were themselves copies primarily of metallic forms. The latest of the Abbadia del Fiume tombs contain black Etruscan pitchers covered with blunt reliefs, like hammered metal. Their designs of petals, of walking men and women, of passant lions, are retouched with engraved lines. The two-chamber tomb, with an open trench between, has given place by this time to tricameral avenue-tombs. One avenue-tomb at Poggio Buco, the latest in order of rational development, shows a tandem arrangement of two chambers, separated by two pillars of rock. The burials at Abbadia stop short of the underground complexes which can be seen in other Etruscan cemeteries. The imported vases do not reach the red-figured style. Only one specimen of the black-figured style has been recorded. The terra-cotta friezes of the three cellas of the temple, on the crest of Poggio Buco, represent war-chariots, infantry, and wild animals, in late seventh-century or early sixth-century Greek style. All the later remains are Roman. We conclude that the crest and slopes of Abbadia del Fiume were vacated by its Etruscan burghers about 600 B.C.

### THIRD SESSION.

The third session was called to order by Professor W. A. Merrill on Tuesday, December 29, at 9.30 A.M.

The Committee on Time and Place of the next Meeting reported through the Chairman, Professor Cooper, a recommendation that the Association meet for its sixth session, as heretofore, at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art in San Francisco, on December 27, 28, and 29, 1904.

The question of the advisability of changing the time of meeting to some other season of the year having been raised, the report was received, but its final adoption was postponed, on motion of Professor Clapp, to the afternoon session.

The Committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's report announced through the Chairman, Mr. Mower, that the books had been examined and found exact.

The report was adopted.

The second Vice-president, Professor Goebel, of Leland Stanford Jr. University, was then called to the chair, while Professor Merrill read the first paper of this session.

6. Lucretiana, by Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California.

In this paper all the passages in Lucretius' poem where the name of Memmius occurs were examined, and the hypothesis was set up that all references to Memmius after i. 62 were due to a recasting of the poem in Memmius' honor, the work having previously been addressed to the general reader. An effort was made to show that spondaic and trochaic words, common in Lucretius' vocabulary, could easily have been withdrawn to make way for the word *Memmi* without changing the sense materially. Even in the more difficult passages, such as v. 8, the original form may have been *dicendum est, deus ille fuit, deus inclutus acer*, cf. i. 40, 66; iii. 10; and in v. 867 the earlier form was possibly *omnia denique sunt tutelae tradita nostrae*. In most cases a Lucretian substitute for *Memmi* may be made without disturbing the rest of the verse. Some remarks were made on ii. 1080, where doubt was expressed as to the propriety of the conjecture *Memmi*. The general conclusion reached was that the poem was written for the general reader who was not an Epicurean; that the poet prefixed an Introduction to the entire poem, mainly complimentary to Memmius; and that in a few places in the remainder of the poem he replaced spondaic or trochaic words by the noun *Memmi*. For some reason unknown he did not continue the revision throughout the poem.

This paper was discussed by Professors Clapp and Randall.

7. Cabala and Alchemy in Goethe's Faust, by Professor Julius Goebel, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

Goethe's sources for the first soliloquy of Faust and the subsequent conjuration of the Earth-spirit are not to be found in the writings of Swedenborg (E. Schmidt, M. Morris), but in the alchemistic and cabalistic literature which Goethe studied, according to his own account, after returning from the University of Leipzig to Frankfurt. The revival of the study of Alchemy, Astrology, and the Cabala, which began during the latter part of the fifteenth century, had spread into all classes of society; in Goethe's immediate circle we find the family physician of his parents and Fräulein von Klettenberg devoted to this study. Despairing of human knowledge and believing in the possibility of obtaining an intuitive insight into the secrets of nature and of the deity, certain religious sects, such as the Pietists, the Moravians, and others, indulged in alchemistic and cabalistic speculations and practices. The oldest scenes of Goethe's Faust are the product of the spirit of these mystic movements of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to a degree much greater than of the spirit which found expression in the Faust story of the sixteenth century.

In connection with this fact it is significant that Faust's father, according to



Goethe, was an alchemist, and that young Faust assisted him in his alchemistic quackery, believing at the same time, like a "pietist," in the efficacy of prayer:

An Hoffnung reich, im Glauben fest,  
Mit Thränen, Seufzen, Händering-n  
Dacht ich das Ende jener Pest  
Vom Herrn des Himmels zu erzwingen.

Alchemistic and cabalistic terms and conceptions are frequent in Faust's soliloquy. The explanations of these, which were offered in the present paper, will be contained in the author's forthcoming edition of Goethe's Faust.

The paper was discussed by Professor Schilling.

The Committee on Nomination of Officers, originally named, being absent, the Chair appointed Professors Bradley, Randall, and Searles in their stead.

The Secretary presented the following resolution:

Every member desiring to read a paper at the annual meeting shall furnish the Secretary, not later than two weeks before the first session, with a short abstract of not more than two hundred and fifty words, outlining the argument and the conclusions of his study. These abstracts shall be printed on the programme for the purpose of allowing members to inform themselves about the nature of the papers, and forming a basis for discussion. The author shall also furnish the Secretary with an estimate of the length of time, not exceeding twenty minutes, which he wishes to occupy.

Upon the suggestion of the Chair, action on this resolution was postponed to the afternoon session.

## 8. On Hiatus in Greek Melic Poetry, by Professor E. B. Clapp, of the University of California.

This paper is printed in full in the first issue of the *Publications in Classical Philology* of the University of California. An abstract of a portion of the paper was printed in Vol. XXXIII of the *Proceedings*, under the title *Hiatus in Pindar*. The writer uses the term "hiatus" loosely to include all cases where a word ending in a vowel is followed immediately, in the same verse, by a word beginning with a vowel.

1. Hiatus due to the loss of  $\rho$  occurs in Pindar about one-third as often as in Homer. The pronoun  $\alpha\iota$  is the only word which regularly shows the influence of  $\rho$ , both in Pindar and in the other melic poets. Less consistent are  $\alpha\nu\alpha\zeta$ ,  $\alpha\delta\upsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\epsilon\lambda\pi\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\xi\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$ ,  $\omicron\lambda\delta\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon\lambda\delta\omicron\nu$ . Terpander and Alcman recognize  $\rho$  almost as regularly as Homer. Alcaeus, Sappho, and Bacchylides show approximately the same usage as Pindar. Simonides exhibits few traces of  $\rho$ , and Anacreon practically none. In a fragment of Timotheus we find  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\alpha$  [ $\rho$ ] $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$ , but in the *Persians* there is no instance of hiatus before a digammated word.

2. Hiatus after a diphthong or long vowel, with the metrical value of a short syllable, is frequent in all the melic poets. Correption in hiatus seems to have

originated with the diphthongs *-ai* and *-oi*, where it is best explained in accordance with the views of Grulich. From these it spread, with the assistance of certain dialectic forms of the genitive and dative endings of the first and second declensions, to the other diphthongs, and even to the long vowels. Grulich should have included the Boeotian dative in *-āi* in his discussion.

According to the older metric, correption in hiatus is practically confined to dactyls; but, if we accept the views of the new school, we must admit numerous cases of shortening in trochees and even in iambs. The writer has elsewhere<sup>1</sup> called attention to this fact as having an important bearing upon the whole metrical question.

3. Most of the instances of hiatus after a diphthong or a long vowel, with long quantity retained, may be explained as by Grulich. The evidence does not justify us in laying much weight on the effect of the dactylic ictus in explaining the hiatus.

4. Hiatus after a short vowel, or "illicit hiatus," scarcely occurs in melic poetry. Here, as in the other kinds of hiatus, the melic poets occupy a middle ground between the freedom of Homer and the extreme finish of the Attic tragedians, though their usage is, on the whole, nearer the latter than the former.

This paper was discussed by Professors Allen, Merrill, Fairclough, Emerson, and Noyes.

#### 9. The Pronunciation of Gallic Clerical Latin in the Merovingian and Later Periods, by Professor C. C. Rice, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The chief sources utilized in the investigation were the following: (1) Latin spellings; (2) Old French spellings; (3) the forms of Old French loan-words; (4) the testimony of grammarians. The most important Merovingian spellings were found in the documents transcribed by Tardif in his *Monuments historiques de la France*. In doubtful cases the facsimiles of the Mss. (published by Letronne) were consulted. For the spelling of the Carolingian and later periods, some hundred volumes of cartularies were examined. The significance of the forms of Old French loan-words was pointed out by Paris (*Journal des savants*, 1900, pp. 294 ff., 356 ff.), who showed that a reform in the pronunciation of Latin must have taken place in the time of Charlemagne, when *ī* and *î* were phonetically identified in order to prevent the graphic confusion of *ī* and *ē*. It is generally assumed that the "correct" pronunciation of Latin was not affected by the operation of vulgar sound-laws; cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung in d. Stud. d. rom. Sprw.*, p. 83. This assumption will not explain the linguistic material of any period, and cannot be reconciled with established physiological principles. The learned pronunciation must have followed all the gradual vulgar sound-changes for long periods, after which it was subject to correction or reform. The spelling of early French monuments reflects faithfully the Latin pronunciation of French scribes, who naturally assigned to the letters of the alphabet the value

<sup>1</sup> In the *Classical Review* for October, 1904.

which they had in their Latin. The Strassburg Oaths (842), which, as is generally admitted, cannot belong to a southern region where free *d* remains *a* (note the neutral vowel in *fradre*, *fradra*, *fazet*, *suo part*, *sendra*, *Karlo*, *Karle*, *Karlus*) apparently show no trace of the important vowel-changes which are clearly attested in the *Eulalia* (881).

Latin source,	<i>d</i>	<i>ē</i>	<i>ē, ī</i>	<i>ō</i>	<i>ō, ū</i>
Symbol in 842,	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>u</i>
Symbol in 881,	<i>e</i>	<i>ie</i>	<i>ei</i>	<i>uo</i>	<i>ou</i>

It is not clear that all the sounds from the same source are identical, for the reason that, although Paris assigns the monuments to the same region, the dialect of the Oaths is not established. In the case of nearly every vowel, however, surprise has been expressed at the apparently archaic phonology of the Oaths; note, for instance, *salvar*, *fradra*; *meus*, *sendra*, *er*; *sit*, *savir*, *podir*; *vol*, *poblo*; *amur*, *suo*. Paris and others consider the much-discussed *d* "a graphic expression of a sound which was no longer *a*." Many scholars also regard the *i* in *podir*, etc., as a reminiscence of the countless Merovingian spellings in which *i* had the same value as *ē* (cf. *habire*, *fedilis*, *ligebus*, *simet*, *fimenā*, *deberimus*, etc.). It has never been shown that the scribe of the Oaths spoke a form of French different from that of the scribe of the *Eulalia*, in point of antiquity or of dialect; and all the peculiar spellings of the former seem to be due to the Merovingian pronunciation of Latin which, as was held by Paris, we should assume as the phonetic basis of this monument. No vowel-shift can be dated after 842 on the ground that the development is not indicated in the spelling of the Oaths. All the important vowel-developments (*a* > *e*, *ē* > *ei*, *ē* > *ie*, *ō* > *ou*, *ō* > *uo*) should be set back into Merovingian or earlier periods, although they naturally found no graphic expression until after the Carolingian reform. The correct pronunciation of the accented vowels in the eighth century was as follows: free *a* > *e*—a front vowel not identical with *e* < *i* nor with *e* < *ē*, but probably identical with the *e* < *d* in the *Eulalia*; checked *ē*, *ī* > *e*; free *ē*, *ī* > *ei*; free *ē* > *ie*; checked *ō*, *ū* > *o*; free *ō*, *ū* > *ou*; free *ō* > *uo*; *ū* > *ū* or *u* as in the vernacular. No account is here taken of nasalization, and cases in which no change occurred are not mentioned. The unaccented vowels seem to have followed the vulgar development to *e*; cf. the English pronunciation of *domus*, *puellas*, with the same final vowel. After the Carolingian reform, the vowels, accented and unaccented, were sounded as follows: *a* = *a*; *ē*, *ē* = *e*; *ī*, *ī* = *i*; *ō*, *ō* = *o*; *ū*, *ū* = *u* or *u*. The distinct articulation of post-tonic vowels made necessary a transfer of the accent to the ultima, where it has remained to this day. The reformed pronunciation did not remain fixed, but followed all the later French sound-changes step by step for long periods. At the time of the Renaissance, a new reform-movement changed the quality of certain vowels which had become nasal, and reintroduced consonants which had become silent in obedience to vulgar sound-laws; after which Latin was pronounced practically as it is pronounced in France nowadays.

The paper was discussed by Professor Matzke.

10. The Parodos of Sophocles' *Antigone*, by President B. I. Wheeler, of the University of California.

The choral passages of Sophocles, particularly in the *Antigone*, are distinguished by an elaborate harmonic arrangement of ideas and figures which, however delicately presented or suggested, betrays to careful inspection a highly conscious and almost artificial analysis. In marked contrast hereto, the current interpretations of the parodos of the *Antigone* yield a lack of balance in the ideas, a confusion of the imagery, and an absence of all unity of plan. The belief that all this is the fault of the interpretations and not of the parodos instigates the writing of this paper.

Leaving out of account the final anapaestic system, which heralds the appearance of Creon, the subject-matter of the ode proper is set forth in seven stanzas, four strophes (or antistrophes), with three alternating anapaestic systems. The first stanza (*i.e.* the first strophe) welcomes the beams of the rising sun, dispelling the terrors of the night, bringing peace to the battle-leaguered town, — “fairest light that e’er shone on Thebes of the seven gates, at last hast thou appeared, O lid of golden day.” The seventh stanza (*i.e.* the second antistrophe) brings the echo hereto in the personal embodiment of Nike, who advances “smiling to greet Thebe of the many chariots,” appointing men to forget the battle and strife. In the first, the beams of the sun are driving the white-shielded Argive foe “a headlong fugitive, prodding him on with ever tightening bit.” In the last, Nike, as counterpart and exponent of the gladsome sun, sends the folk of Thebes in festal procession to the temples of their gods. The ἤλθε Νίκα repeats the ἀκρίς ἀέλιον μολοῦσα, as the τῆ πολυαρμάτων ἀντιχαρεῖσα Θήβα reflects τὸ κάλλιστον ἐπταπύλιν φανέν Θήβα.

Framed between these two stanzas, which reveal the spiritual attitude of the song and yield the atmosphere of the picture, — which voice the exceeding joy of light out of darkness, and of victory out of impending defeat, — stands the body of the ode, the five central stanzas, which tell the story of the battle itself. The battle is presented in its three phases — the onslaught of the foe, the even-matched struggle, the sudden discomfiture and rout of the Argive at the moment when his triumph seemed sure. The story is not told, however, as a continuous narrative, but is fashioned rather as a thrice-told tale. Stanzas two and three tell it all, — onslaught, struggle, and rout, — under the figure of the conflict between the white-winged eagle and the serpent. Then stanzas four and five tell it again, — onslaught, struggle, and rout, — but under another figure, and introduce the second tale as an explanation or epexegetis of the first. Of this epexegetis the particle γάρ, of line 127, is the symbol. Thereupon again stanza six begins the tale, this time without figure and in the directer language of fact: “For seven captains at the seven gates arrayed, equals matched against equals,” but again introducing it as epexegetis of the preceding with the particle γάρ of line 141. Three times under three forms or figures the onslaught has been set forth, each time with use of an anapaestic system.

The third form of the statement, namely that of stanza six, which, as we have seen, reaches at last the plain language of fact, lays its stress on the even matching of strength against strength, man against man; it is “seven against seven,” “equal against equal”; yea, with one of the pairs, the contest is even matched to the extent of πατὴρ ἐνδὲς μητρός τε μῖα, and therefrom arises no issue of victory; with them the battle remains drawn; forever evenly matched (δὶκαρεῖς . . . κοινού . . . ἀμφω). For the others there is a decision, as shown by the πάγχαλκα

τέλη, the symbols and prizes of victory (cf. Pindar, *Olym.* II, 67; *Isthm.* I, 27) left in the hands of the arbiter Zeus.

Returning now to the first form of the story, that contained in stanzas two and three, I believe there can be no doubt that the imagery suggested by the words is that of a self-consistent picture, namely, the picture of a contest between the eagle representing Argos and the serpent representing Thebes. The Thebans are the *δρακοντογενεῖς*. The eagle comes from without—flies over to the land. It comes in noisy and defiant onset, shrill screaming (*ὀξέα κλάζων*), for lo, it was from out of the wrangling strifes of Polyneikes that it had taken wing. Over the snake as genius of the place and symbol of home, over the roof-trees of Thebes (*ὕπερ μελάρθρων*) it poises itself, and its blood-thirsting beak yawns before the seven-gated mouth of its prey. But before it could glut its jaws with Theban blood,—before Hephaestus could lay his grip on the coronet of towers,—it was gone, scared away by the din that Ares raised.<sup>1</sup> That the imagery of metaphor is here, and that it is presented according to a self-consistent picture, there can be no doubt; but it is only a pattern glimmering through the fabric, sketched in golden threads. So we shall find it to be in the second form of the story, though there the pattern is still more dimly sketched.

This second form of the story is presented in stanzas four and five. The parallelism with the first form, *i.e.* stanzas two and three, is unmistakable. The onset of the antagonist is loud and defiant; there are the “boasts of a haughty tongue” (*μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους*), “the pride of rattling gold” (*χρυσοῦ καναχῆς ὑπεροπλίας*), “the snorting blasts of hostile winds” (*ἐπέπνει ριπαῖς ἐχθίστων ἀνέμων*). Defeat overwhelms the foe just as he is “hasting to raise the cry of victory” (*νίκην ὀρμῶντ’ ἀλαλάσαι*). Zeus is here, too, the arbiter, the supreme *βραβεύς*, whose will allots defeat and victory. “*Ἡφαιστον* (l. 123) returns as the *πυρφόρος* (l. 135). Ares appears as the helper of Thebes at the crisis; *μέγας Ἄρης δεξιόσειρος* at the end of stanza five echoes and exactly parallels the *πάταγος Ἄρεος* at the end of stanza three. Of the picture of eagle and serpent there is, however, no longer a trace; that, having served its purpose, has faded away, and another takes its place. The scene shifts to the stadion, and the contest assumes the form of the four-horse chariot race. We can hear the shouts of the charioteer in the lead, the rattle and clank of harnesses and trappings, the snort of the steeds. Already the foremost chariot is making the last turn to the goal *βαλβίδων ἐπ’ ἄκρων*, and its driver is impatient to raise the claiming cry of victory (*νίκην ὀρμῶντ’ ἀλαλάσαι*), when the competing team, in which great Ares is the right trace-horse (*δεξιόσειρος*), surges against him, and, pushing him and his aside (*στυφελίζων*), hurls him from his car to the earth (*ἀντιτύπα δ’ ἐπὶ γῇ πέσσε τανταλωθεῖς*), and scatters all in confusion and ruin (*εἶχε δ’ ἄλλα τὰ μὲν, ἄλλα δ’ ἐπ’ ἄλλοις ἐπένωμα*).

That the effect of the picture lingers on, even in the seventh stanza, is betrayed by the appearance of Nike advancing with smiles of congratulation to meet the victorious Thebes, Thebe of the many chariots. It is not a Nike like that of Paenion which the poet has here in mind, but the type familiar to us from the vase-paintings, the cupid-like Nike who, with the fillet as badge of victory in her

<sup>1</sup> We can scarcely avoid the conviction that *δυσχείρωμα* (l. 126) was coined to echo *στεφάνωμα* (l. 122); through the din raised by the fighters on the towers the *στεφάνωμα* became the eagle's *δυσχείρωμα* (*στεφάνω* : *χείρω*) instead of its easy prey.

hand, flits down to greet and decorate the victorious charioteer (e.g. Reinach, *Peintures*; Millin, Pl. II, 60; II, 72; cf. also Millin, I, 43, 45, and Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, fig. 2137; Panofka, *Cabinet Pourtalès*, Pl. 33; *Arch. Zeit.* 1867, Pl. 226).

If the interpretation here offered for stanzas four and five may appear from internal evidences possible and even probable, it is raised to what we must consider a demonstrated certainty, as certainty goes in things so human as these, by reference to the full-drawn picture of the four-horse chariot race of the Pythian games, which the same artist has left us for comparison in the pages of the *Electra* (ll. 696-760). The two passages differ in their character, and especially in their use of scenes and incidents taken from the chariot race, as widely as in their date of composition. One uses the material delicately in suggestive metaphor and as decoration; the other introduces it directly in narration. And yet it appears, if our interpretation of stanzas four and five be correct, that in both similar features and similar incidents dominate the poet's attention as characteristic of the event. There is the shout of the drivers and the clatter of the cars; "And all with one accord shouted at their horses, and shook the reins with both hands; the whole course was filled with the din of clattering cars." And there is the snorting of the horses as they come on; "And all in confused mass plied their goads and spared not, each that he might pass the wheels of his rivals and the snorting of their steeds, for alike at their backs and at their advancing wheels the breath of the horses foamed and cast its spray." Here, too, the right trace-horse (*δεξιόσειρος*), as *δεξιὸν σείραϊον ἵππον*, plays a distinguished part, though mentioned, I believe, nowhere outside of these two passages in all Greek literature. Here, too, chariots collide and are scattered in ruin about, "till the whole arena of Crisa was strewn with the wreck of chariots." And then at the last, and as the supreme incident, just as the foremost driver was making the last turn to the goal with victory all but in his grasp, he is thrown from his car with all the swing of the Antigone's *πανταλωθεῖς* and dashed to the ground (cf. *ἀντιτύπη δ' ἐπὶ γῆ, Antigone*, 134).

This paper was discussed by Professors Fairclough, Emerson, and Merrill.

#### FOURTH SESSION.

The Fourth Session was called to order at 2.30 P.M., by Professor Merrill, in the lecture room of the Museum of the Department of Anthropology, of the University of California, in the Affiliated Colleges in San Francisco.

The Committee on Nomination of Officers for the ensuing year made the following nominations:

*President*, W. A. Merrill, University of California.

*Vice-Presidents*, J. Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

E. B. Clapp, University of California.

*Secretary and Treasurer*, J. E. Matzke, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

*Executive Committee*, The above-named officers and

H. R. Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

A. F. Lange, University of California.

J. E. Church, Jr., University of Nevada.

H. K. Schilling, University of California.

On motion of Professor Clapp, the report was adopted, and the Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association for the gentlemen as nominated.

The question of time and place of the next meeting was then called up again, and after some discussion it was voted not to make any change, and to adopt the recommendation of the committee, that the sixth annual meeting be held on December 27, 28, and 29, 1904, at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art, as heretofore.

The resolution of the Secretary affecting the form of the programme, was called up, and after reading and discussion, was adopted on motion of Professor Bradley.

11. A Neglected Source of Corneille's *Horace*, by Professor J. E. Matzke, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The paper has appeared in full in *Modern Philology*, I, pp. 345-354. It was discussed by Professor Clapp.

12. Influence of Greek and Roman Art on Vergil, by Professor H. R. Fairclough, of Leland Stanford Jr. University.

This paper, to be published elsewhere in full, was prompted by a recent visit to the principal European museums of Greek and Roman art. It presented in outline a study of the influence of earlier or contemporary art upon Vergil, as seen in his descriptions, mythology, similes, and otherwise.

This paper was discussed by Professors Merrill, Goebel, and Emerson.

13. Numeral Systems of the Native Languages of California, by Dr. A. L. Kroeber, of the University of California.

The numeral systems of the many and often unrelated Indian languages of California show great variability. Frequently the numeral words of two closely kindred dialects differ in great part. This is due to the fact that the numerals above three are often compound or derivative words, descriptive of an arithmetical process, and that quite different processes are sometimes followed even by cognate languages. Besides the more common quinary, decimal, and vigesimal modes of counting, there are frequent traces of a quaternary method, and one numeral system of Northern California is quaternary throughout. Other processes that occur in the formation of numerals are subtraction, duplication, and

multiplication. The variety of the systems found proves that there is no necessary or even usual relation of the quinary and vigesimal methods, as opposed to the decimal; quinary-decimal and decimal-vigesimal systems occur. Though numeral systems, visibly descriptive of the process of counting, have usually been considered undeveloped, so far as known the systems of all the languages of California extend into the hundreds. Phonetic analogy exerts considerable influence, the words for two and three being often similar. On account of the diversity of structure of the numerals, they are of less value in California, for determining linguistic affinity, than is usually the case.

This paper was discussed by President Wheeler, Professor Clapp, and Mr. Goddard.

The meeting was then adjourned at 4.15 P.M., and the remainder of the afternoon was spent in an examination of the collection of Etruscan, Greek, and Peruvian antiquities of the Museum.

#### FIFTH SESSION.

The Fifth Session was called to order by Professor Merrill at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art at 9.45 A.M.

14. Notes on Chapter XII of Plutarch's *Life of Pericles*, by Professor W. S. Ferguson, of the University of California.

This paper appears in full in the TRANSACTIONS.

It was discussed by Professor Clapp.

15. Word-Accent in Latin Verse, by Dr. B. O. Foster, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University. The author having been called to his home, the paper was read by title.

16. The Study of English Etymology during the Seventeenth Century, by Professor Ewald Flügel, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The author characterized briefly the etymological remarks in Camden, Verstegan, Selden, Howell, Sir Thomas Browne, Fuller, and the earlier Lexicographers from Minsheu to Somner. He dwelt more fully on Casaubon, *De lingua Saxonica* (1650), and Passeratius, *De literarum inter se cognatione ac permutatione* (1650), an essay containing a number of observations which make him a forerunner of Jacob Grimm. Stephen Skinner (died in 1667; *Etymologicon* published after his death in 1671) stands highest among the etymologists of the seventeenth century; he is the first systematic etymologist who works with the idea of etymological laws (which were ridiculed by Casaubon, and not recognized by Junius). His *Prolegomena* contain in their *Canones Etymologici* the first methodical equations for the sound changes (of *a* into *o*, *cg* into *dg*, *d* into *th*, etc.). Skinner is



the first to recognize the facts of a history of the changes of meaning and of popular etymology (*voces exterae cum in nostram linguam transeunt saepe per errorem vulgi propinquitate soni decepti, mirificis terminationibus ex sermone nostro depromptis donantur*). His great fault is the lack of application of his *Canones* in the articles of the Etymological Dictionary. Even if he is freer from the habit of introducing Greek etyma than Casaubon before him, or Junius after him, he falls constantly into the mistake of all the seventeenth-century etymologists of not being satisfied with establishing the relationship of a word with the nearest related language, but of trying to hunt his words through half a dozen remote languages, adding from each one a new fantastic etymon, so that the *vel*'s and *sive*'s become numberless.

Franciscus Junius was a great pathfinder in other fields than etymology. Here he was not in advance of his time. The idea of a law, of a necessary mutation of sounds according to certain fixed principles, was yet foreign to him, and is scarcely traceable in George Hickes' *Institutiones*, 1689.

This paper was discussed by Professor Merrill.

17. The Construction of Juvenal, Satire I, by Professor J. E. Church, Jr., of the University of Nevada.

In the absence of the author, the paper was read by Professor Elmore.

Regarding the date, original form, and coherence of Juvenal, Satire I, considerable diversity of opinion still exists.

An analysis of the satire in question reveals two facts: first, that this satire is purely introductory in purpose, and second, that it is largely argumentative in style. The method of argument is, however, peculiar, since it consists of a series of word-pictures — after the style of modern newspaper cartoons — accompanied by rhetorical questions to present and enforce the argument. This argument advances consecutively from beginning to end, although at one point the transition is abrupt, and the latter part of the satire unduly extended by a digression.

These statements may be best illustrated by an outline of the satire:

*Exordium*, vs. 1-21:

1. Shall I always be a listener merely, though tormented by wearisome and worn-out themes? 1-14.
2. I too have had an education and it is foolish when you meet so many poets everywhere to spare paper that will surely go to waste, 15-18.
3. But I shall be a satirist, and if you have the time, I'll tell you why, 19-21.

*Confirmatio*, 22-146:

1. I am overwhelmed with living examples of prosperous incapacity and successful villainy, 22-80.
2. The scope of my activity shall be *all* the extremes of human life known since the Flood, 81-86; for when were vices more abundant or more extreme? 87-146.

*Peroratio*, 147-171:

Vice has reached its climax. Now's the time to make the effort of one's life.

To pass into detail, it will be seen that the author's main purpose is to defend his choice of a career as a satirist, and to discuss briefly the scope and method of his work. The tone of the poet is declamatory, rather than epistolary, and the public is his audience. The argument broadly follows the lines of the simpler orations of classical times, while refutations of supposed objections freely occur.

The *exordium* is skilfully wrought out. The "sarcastic indignation" with which he attacks the wearisome tribe of poets and declaimers, and threatens to turn poet in self-defence, wins attention for the new aspirant and a keen desire to hear him further. He ends his *exordium* by declaring his intention to specialize in satire.

In the *confirmatio* the impetuosity of his indignation increases until it reaches its climax at v. 80, when it comes to an abrupt close. This effort is made up of a series of outbursts, each more indignant than the preceding, and occasioned by a series of scenes, each group of which is more exasperating than the one before. To illustrate again by an outline of the verses in question, but with the class substituted for the person:

1. (a) When a eunuch marries, 22,  
     (b) and women have lost their pristine modesty, 22-23,  
     (c) and money is preferred to ancestry, 24-25,  
     (d) and slaves have become insufferable dudes, 26-29,  
     — it is difficult not to write satire.
2. For who is so tolerant and emotionless that he could restrain himself at sight of  
     (a) disgusting pettifoggers, 32-33,  
     (b) informers and betrayers, 33-36,  
     (c) and men who earn their legacies at night ? 37-39.  
     Digression in illustration, 40-44.
3. Why tell how my blood boils at the arrogance of  
     (a) successful betrayers of innocent wards, 46-47,  
     and the defeat of justice by  
     (b) the betrayers of a public trust ? 47-48.  
     Digression in illustration, 49-50.

The outburst now takes the form of a *refutatio*. The intensity increases and the illustrations, although chosen at random, have been selected, with one exception, from the worst class of offenders, viz., from the criminal and very immoral.

4. Do I not consider such themes unworthy of Horace? Not treat them,  
     but rather tales of Hercules and the winged carpenter ! 51-54,  
     (a) when the adulteress' husband inherits the property of her paramour,  
         if she be debarr'd, 55-57,  
     (b) and the young sport is permitted to look forward to an army cap-  
         taincy, 58-62.  
     One feels impelled to choose more modern subjects and write them up  
     in full when  
     (c) the luxurious forger rides by in state, 64-68,  
     (d) and the influential husband-poisoner confronts you, 69-72.

Rhetorical outburst : Do something worthy of the penitentiary if you wish to be anybody, 73-76.

Who can rest in the presence of

(e) the seducer,

(f) betrothed maidens ruined,

(g) and adulterers in their teens! 77-78.

If nature refuses, indignation will write as best it can, — such verse as *I* write, or Cluvienus.

The central thought which binds this portion of the *confirmatio* together and gives it unity is the overwhelming awfulness of human perversity, which compels one to cry out against it. The external evidence of this unity is the arrangement in order of climax of rhetorical outbursts, as for example, "it is difficult not to write satire," "who is so emotionless that he could restrain himself," "my blood boils," and "if nature refuses, indignation will write." Furthermore, in one place a transitional particle is employed, while the *refutatio*, which forms an organic part of this climax, is skilfully employed to relieve the strain of the long recital of examples, and yet to increase their cumulative effect. The short epigrammatic digressions in illustration and the rhetorical outburst, 73-76, need no defence.

There are some exceptions to the increasing emphasis from our point of view, but not from Juvenal's; yet these are few. The allusion to Matho, the pettifogger, in class 2, instead of class 1, is probably due to Matho's trickiness, together with his disgusting physique. That the latter was in large measure the reason, is shown by Juvenal's ready eye for corpulent individuals. (See 2. 141, 8. 147, 12. 11.) The mention of the young sport looking forward to an army captaincy, 58-62, in connection with things morally black, is strong evidence of a biased judgment on the part of Juvenal. He seems to have been disappointed in his military ambition and to have magnified his wrongs.

Verses 77-78: "Who can rest for thought of the seducer who plays on his daughter-in-law's greed, of betrothed girls ruined, and adulterers in their teens?" on the ground of distortion have been attacked by Teuffel, who was inclined to consider them, or the preceding rhetorical outburst, as a later insertion. Though Juvenal is open to the charge of unnecessary diffuseness, still no one would charge him with great lack of judgment for placing unnatural moral depravity at the climax of his recital of vice.

The portion of the satire beginning with verse 81 is more moderate in tone and abounds in reminiscent digression. The first verses are abrupt. For these reasons, the unity of the poem and the integrity of the text have been assailed.

Pearson and Strong (*Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*, 1892) suggest that "the author had written two different prefaces at various times, and had then decided to weld them together." The difficulty in the way of this interpretation is that the two introductions referred to are in no particular alike, and furthermore that the second half of the satire is supplementary to the first. Even if verses 81-146, *i.e.* the second half of the *confirmatio*, as they propose, were inserted into the poem at a later date, the unity of the whole was thereby in no wise impaired. If, however, any portion were inserted at a later date, I should be inclined to suggest verses 81-86; for with verse 87 the argument ending at verse 80 is resumed. But such concession is scarcely necessary, in view of Juvenal's tendency to state

general truths which lead skilfully back to the main theme (Vahlen, *Ind. lect. aest.*, Univ. Berlin, 1884), and the frequent instances of abrupt, and even awkward transitions found in his works, as 7. 36, 13. 86, and others.

The earliest date at which this book was published seems according to all evidence to be 100 A.D. The latest date, however, has not been so unanimously agreed upon. Friedländer has proposed a date between the years 112 and 116, in order that this book may not be separated from Book ii by a longer interval than that which separates the other books of Juvenal's satires. F. Haverfield, quoted by Wilson, *Juvenal*, p. xii, n. 1, on the other hand, thinks that these poems, which "reek of Domitian's reign," were published soon after 100 A.D. The real difficulty in the way of assigning a date much later than 100, was pointed out by Lewis, in his translation of Juvenal as early as 1882; namely, that Juvenal could not have mentioned "informers" and "accusers" after Trajan "had put an end to their nefarious trade," a thing that must have occurred before the delivery of Pliny's Panegyric, or at least before its present revision was published.

This argument should receive greater consideration in view of the fact that Juvenal ceases entirely his references to the acts of Domitian in the other books of his satires.

Though the time allowed for writing is quite short, yet it is possible, by assuming that the first satire was written last, or that the statement regarding Marius was a later insertion, to place the publication of Book i before Trajan proceeded against the informers. The long interval that would in that case elapse before 116 A.D., when the second book was published, may have been employed, as the poet's earlier life had been, in declaiming.

This paper was discussed by Professors Flügel, Merrill, and Elmore.

18. *Cretati pedes*, by Dr. Charles J. O'Connor, of the University of California.

The paper was an attempt to account for the practice of whitening the feet of slaves who were imported and sold in the markets at Rome, a custom which is referred to in Tibullus 2. 3. 60, Ovid, *Amores*, 1. 8. 64, and Juvenal 1. 111. The theory proposed is that the chalk and gypsum were applied to the feet and legs of slaves as remedies for ulcers and other ailments which were induced or aggravated by the hardships of confinement. It seems that only newly imported slaves had their feet whitened. There are numerous passages in Celsus and Pliny the Elder which show that diseases of the feet played an important part in Roman medical practice. Instances are given of diseases of this nature introduced into Italy from other countries. The crowding on shipboard, the use of fetters, the salt water, must have affected the feet and legs considerably. In Celsus and Pliny there are many passages which indicate that Roman physicians considered chalk and gypsum valuable therapeutic agents, employing them frequently in the treatment of ulcers. Although these may not have possessed great healing properties, they would have formed a protecting crust when applied to a sore, and thus might have afforded relief and prevented the spread of the disease.

Adjourned at 11.45 A.M.

## PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST

The Sixth Annual Meeting was held in San Francisco at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art on December 27, 28, and 29, 1904.

SAN FRANCISCO, December 27, 1904.

The meeting was called to order on Tuesday, December 27, at 2 P.M., by the President, Professor W. A. Merrill, of the University of California.

The Secretary read his report.

The Report of the Finances of the Association, presented next, was as follows :—

### RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, Dec. 27, 1903 . . . . .	\$30.10
Annual dues and Initiation fees . . . . .	240.00
	<u>\$270.10</u>

### EXPENDITURES.

Sent to Professor Smyth, June 25, 1904 . . . . .	\$214.97
Postage and expressage . . . . .	15.30
Printing . . . . .	23.00
Incidentals . . . . .	.50
Total . . . . .	<u>\$253.77</u>
Balance on hand, Dec. 26, 1904 . . . . .	16.33
	<u>\$270.10</u>

The Chair then appointed the following committees :—

*Nomination of Officers:* Professors Murray, Bradley, and Ferguson.

*Time and Place of Next Meeting:* Professors Chambers, Elmore, and Mr. Mower.

*Treasurer's Report:* Professors Margolis, Searles, and Mr. Burrill.

The reading and discussion of papers was then begun.

1. On *Iliad* IX, 334–343, by Professor A. T. Murray, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

In the great speech in which Achilles declares his refusal to accept Agamemnon's overtures and his scorn of his gifts, occurs the well-known passage (I, 334–343), the most splendid outburst in the whole impassioned speech.

For poetic quality and force the passage has commanded universal admiration.

One thing only calls for comment : Achilles speaks of Briseis, the captive slave, as his *ἄλοχος*. Objecting to this, some of the older editors altered the punctuation, putting a period, or at least a semicolon, after *ἐλκερ*, and in this they have been followed by Cauer, van Leeuwen and da Costa, Leaf in his second edition, and, most recently, Ludwich.

We may first say frankly, in the light of what we know of the Heroic Age, that Briseis certainly was not the *ἄλοχος* of Achilles. That word properly denotes a wedded wife, and she was an alien and a captive. She had been given to him by the Greeks as a prize of valor, as his share of the spoil. She was a chattel, according to the ethics of the age (see II, 57), and Achilles himself speaks contemptuously of her in T, 58, asking Agamemnon if it had been worth while for them to engage in strife *ἕνεκα κόρης*, for a mere girl's sake, — words which are put into the mouth of Agamemnon, B, 377. More than this ; Agamemnon offers to give to Achilles any one of his own daughters in marriage (I, 144 ff., 286 ff.), and Achilles speaks of taking a wife on his return to Phthia (I, 393 ff.).

Yet there are other aspects of the case. This very fact that Achilles is unwedded proves that Briseis does not occupy the position of a *παλλακίς* beside a lawful wife. If she did, we may say that the word *ἄλοχος* could not possibly be used of her. Again we must note the deep and mutual affection existing between the two. This is manifest in A, 348 ff., and especially in the passage before us. We may refer also to T, 282 ff. Now, because of this love of Achilles for Briseis, she holds a place different from that of the other captive women (*δμῳαί*, Σ, 28). This is seen plainly if Ω, 643 be contrasted with Ω, 675 ff. Here the *ἑταροί* and *δμῳαί* are bidden to wait on Priam and the herald, and to make beds for them without in the corridor. Achilles naturally sleeps in the *μυχός* of the house, and Briseis at her lord's side. This is the place that is hers. The language used is closely parallel with that applied to Alcinous and Arete (η, 346 f.), to Menelaus and Helen (δ, 304 f.), to Zeus and Hera (A, 611). This is only in part weakened by the fact that very similar language is used of Achilles and Diomedes (I, 663 ff.). In that case there is no hint that Diomedes occupies a place hers by recognized right ; there is no contrast between her and the other *δμῳαί*, no suggestion that she is beloved by Achilles. These facts account for the use of the epithet *θυμαρέα* in the passage under consideration. Besides κ, 362, where it is used of the bath, it occurs, ψ, 232, of Penelope : —

κλαῖε δ' ἔχων ἄλοχον θυμαρέα, κεδνὰ λδύαν.

We are, therefore, justified in using a strong equivalent in translating.

The passage is clearly interpreted by the scholiasts and by Eustathius : *ἠῆξεσθε τὴν ὕβριν ἄλοχον αὐτὴν εἰπὼν καὶ θυμαρέα*.

With this the following lines are in complete accord. Cauer, *Rheinisches Museum*, XLIV, 357, finds the passage incoherent, so that an analysis may be permitted. The sense of the wrong done him leads Achilles to utter the bitter words *τῇ παριαύων τερπέσθω*. He has given up Briseis ; Agamemnon may keep her ; but these words show the impossibility of a reconciliation. Great as was his love for Briseis, his wrath against Agamemnon is greater ; he will not be appeased by her return. Similarly in T there is no reconciliation ; there a new and vaster passion, the thirst for vengeance for his fallen friend, fills his soul. To this, even his hatred of Agamemnon is subordinated. "But," he goes on, "why must the

Argives war against the Trojans? Why has he marshalled and brought hither a host, this son of Atreus? Was it not for fair-tressed Helen's sake? Do they then, alone of mortal men, love their wives, the sons of Atreus? Nay, since whoso is a good man and of right mind loves and cherishes his own, even as I, too, loved *her* with all my heart, captive of my spear though she was." For comment we need go no further than the scholiast on vs. 339: *εἰ μὲν γὰρ μικρὸν ἡγείται τὸ ἀδικηθῆναι περὶ γυναῖκα, πολεμεῖν οὐκ ἔδει περὶ Ἑλένης . . . εἰ δὲ χαλεπὸν καὶ μέγα, πῶς ἄπερ παθὼν ὑπ' ἁλλοφύλων ἀγανακτεῖ, ταῦτα εἰς τοὺς φίλους ποιῶν οὐκ ἀδικεῖν νομίζει*;

The passage is one of great power. It is the rhetoric of passion; and it is this passion that justifies the employment of the word *ἄλοχος*.

We turn now to the altered punctuation. A full stop is put after *εἶλετ'*. The following passage then means: "He has a *wife*, the darling of his heart; let him have joy of *her*, not rob another of his prize—a slave-girl." In regard to this, I note the following points: (1) The splendid rhetoric, the passion is gone. This is, of course, no argument, if the old interpretation is philologically untenable, the new philologically sound. (2) We are asked to refer the phrase *ἄλοχον θυμαρέα* to Clytemnestra,—to her, concerning whom Agamemnon had publicly said that he preferred the captive Chryseis (A, 113). This may, of course, be said with irony, and may refer back to Agamemnon's words in A; but Cauer's further suggestion that mention of Clytemnestra is needed to lead up to the mention of Helen seems to me based upon a misapprehension. (3) The phrase *τῇ παραύων τερπέσθω* also refers, on this interpretation, to Clytemnestra. Yet she is in Argos, and has been there these nine years past, so that the words, thus read, are, at best, an empty mockery. (4) The sacrifice of so much of the force and spirit of the passage is wholly in vain. Even if we read it thus, Achilles still speaks of Briseis as his *ἄλοχος*. This is inherent in the argument; it cannot be eliminated. "If *they* love their wives, do not *I* love mine?" Leaf, a staunch advocate of the altered punctuation, is, in his note on 339, honest almost to the point of *naïveté*, "*i.e.* were we not brought hither on account of a stolen wife by one that is himself a wife-stealer?"—a paraphrase that virtually admits the identification which he so strenuously denies.

Finally I add some notes on the use of the word *ἄλοχος*. This, with *ἄκοιτις*, *παράκοιτις*, *δάμαρ*, *δαρ* (rarely), and very often *γυνή*, is regularly used in the meaning, *wife*. The corresponding masculines are *ἄκοιτης* and *παρακοιτης*, with *ἄνθρωπος* and *πόσις*. *ἄνθρωπος* and *γυνή* are so common in other than these special meanings that they hardly concern us here. There are in Homer more than one hundred and fifty occurrences of these feminine words (omitting *γυνή*). They all denote properly a wedded wife; with *ἄλοχος*, in particular, the epithets *κουριδίη* and *μνηστή* often occur. Further, it should be observed that *ἄλοχος*, *ἄκοιτις*, and *παράκοιτις*, with the two masculines *ἄκοιτης* and *παρακοιτης*, are virtually etymological equivalents: *ἡ μετέχουσα τῆς κοίτης τοῦ ἀνδρός*. There is nothing to denote that the union is a lawful one.

The ethics of the Heroic Age regarded union of an irregular character, with captives *e.g.*, as a matter of course. The injured wife might object (Aesch. *Ag.* 1438 ff.), though she did not always. Two remarkable passages, Soph. *Trach.* 445-449 and 459 ff. and Eur. *Andr.* 222 ff., point to the contrary. But for a woman standing in this relation to one of the princes, *Homer has no fixed term*.

The word *παλλακίς* occurs but thrice (I, 449 and 452, and ξ, 203), always denoting a concubine, as contrasted with a lawful wife. We have, of course, *δούλη* and *δμῶαι*, but these words have no special reference to the relationship which we are considering.

It will be seen at a glance, therefore, that in speaking of Briseis, Homer was practically forced to use one of the words normally denoting wife; she was no mere *παλλακίς*.

*ἄλοχος* beyond question denotes properly a wedded wife. It is contrasted with *δούλη*, I, 409 (cf. Eur. *Andr.* Fr. 132 N<sup>2</sup>), with *παλλακίς*, ξ, 202. It appears as a synonym of *ἄκοιτις*, I, 399, and *ἄκοιτις* is contrasted with *παλλακίς*, I, 450. The following passages, however, suffice to show that we are entirely justified in claiming a certain laxity in the use of these words. Save the doubtful instance, δ, 623 (where Eustathius has *παραχρώμενος τῇ λέξει*), we shall find no case of *ἄλοχος* applied to a slave; but it will appear that these terms are applied to those who cannot strictly be called lawful wives.

Helen is, past question, the lawful wife of Menelaus (*κουριδίη ἄλοχος*, H, 392, N, 626, *παράκοιτις*, I, 53). Yet she speaks of herself as the *ἄκοιτις* of Paris, Z, 350; the poet so speaks of her, I, 447; and Paris calls her his *ἄλοχος*, Z, 337. We may pass over the fact that she was to be the *ἄκοιτις* of the victor, I, 138, but if she is herself the *ἄλοχος* of Paris, and the word is restricted to this meaning, how can she say to Aphrodite, —

*εἰς δ' ἐκ' σ' ἦ ἄλοχον ποιήσεται ἡ δ' γε δούλην* (I, 409) ?

So, too, we must note her attitude toward her union with Paris, as seen in her better moments (I, 410 ff.).

Hera is constantly called the *ἄλοχος* and *παράκοιτις* of Zeus, nor will any one question her right to the title. Yet in λ, 580, this title is given to Leto, and in Φ, 498 f., Hermes says to Leto that he will not fight with her : —

*ἀργαλέον γὰρ  
πληκτίζεσθ' ἀλόχοισι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο.*

So in Soph. *Trach.* 1149, Alcmena is called the *ἄκοιτις* of Zeus.

In ε, 118 ff., Calypso uses *ἄκοιτης* of mortal men beloved by goddesses, meaning Odysseus in her own case.

There remain in Homer two important passages: T, 298, and δ, 623. The latter is almost certainly spurious. In the former, Patroclus is said by Briseis to have promised to make her the *κουριδίη ἄλοχος* of Achilles. This has, of course, disturbed many. Yet we are dealing with the words of the kindest of Homer's heroes, who is attempting to console a desolate woman. What wonder that he promises more than he can perform ? (Lang).

Many interesting passages could be adduced concerning similar extensions of meaning in the case of *γάμος* or *γάμοι*, of *νυμφίος*, etc., of *πόσις*, of *σύνευνος*, and so on; but the Homeric instances adduced above suffice. Interesting, too, are many passages in drama, notably the portrayal of Tecmessa in the *Ajax*, and Teucer's proud defence of his mother — a princess, yet a captive and a slave.

The paper was discussed by Professor Clapp.



2. Athenian Politics in the Early Third Century before Christ, by Professor W. S. Ferguson, University of California.

The result of this investigation is that between 301 and 295, and again in 276/5 ff., an oligarchy friendly to Macedon had control of the Athenian government.

The chief evidence is as follows:—

A. During both of these periods and, with a few explicable exceptions, at no other time within the era under consideration, men who, either in person or through their relatives, were connected with earlier oligarchies, took part in public life.

B. In 301 and again in 276/5 a government hostile to Macedon was superseded by one friendly to that country. This hostile government is proved by its personnel to have been democratic.

C. Constitutional changes took place in 301, 295/4, and 275. Their character is intimated by the following observations:—

1. In 295/4 an important treasury (*ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*), intrusted between 307/6 and 295/4 to a single officer, was placed in the hands of a college. It was restored to a single officer in 276/5. The dates are, however, only approximate.

2. In 301 another treasury administered during the fourth century by the "treasurer of the people" (*ταμίης τοῦ δήμου*) was abolished. Its funds were transferred to "an inspector and the trittarchs" (*ὁ ἐξετάστης καὶ οἱ τριττάρχαι*). There had earlier been a board of inspectors; now there was a single officer. Both the inspectors and the trittarchs were earlier connected with military funds. The inspector was elected; the treasurer whom he superseded was chosen by lot. The inspector and the trittarchs disappeared after 295/4, and their functions were taken over by the college then constituted, as described above in 1.

3. A scrutiny (*δοκιμασία*) of the qualifications of applicants for the citizenship, instituted under the extreme oligarchy of 322/1–319/8 and dispensed with subsequently, was revived in 301. It was extended in 276/5 (in at least one case) to citizens who had applied for civic honors.

D. We have direct evidence in an inscription of the year 271/0 (Pseudo-Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators*, 851 D) that between 303/2 and 271/0 oligarchies controlled Athens on two different occasions. On the first occasion, Demochares, Demosthenes' nephew, was in exile, on the second, aloof from public life.

E. It is impossible to explain the continuance of Demochares' exile between 301 and 295 except on the assumption of oligarchic control during that interval.

F. In consequence of factional strife between the democrats and the oligarchs, a tyrant, Lachares by name, succeeded in making himself master of Athens in 295. Demetrius Poliorcetes restored a democracy in 294. Had that party thrown him over seven years earlier, he would not have trusted it again.

Printed in full in *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, V, 1 (1905).

Discussion by Professors Murray and Clapp.

3. Luigi Pulci, the First of the Courtly *Cantastorie*, by Professor C. Searles, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The paper began with the discussion of the different opinions in regard to

Pulci's literary position. A comparison of the *Morgante Maggiore* with its source the *Orlando* (Hübscher, Marburg, 1886) supports the view that the poet was chiefly concerned in changing *materia da piazza* into *materia da camera* (*Morg. Mag.* XXVIII, 142, l. 5). Pulci's work, then, serves to connect the works of his famous artist-successors, Ariosto and Tasso, with their predecessors the *cantastorie* and the *jongleurs*.

Discussion by Professors Matzke and Johnston.

#### 4. The Siamese Vocabulary: its Formal and Conceptual Features, by Professor Cornelius Beach Bradley, of the University of California.

The Siamese is not strictly a monosyllabic language, though it is constantly so characterized. In order to ascertain the actual proportion of monosyllabic in a representative section, as well as the origin and nature of the variants from the monosyllabic type, a vocabulary of one thousand separate words was compiled from a very simple piece of native writing. Only seven hundred and fifteen words were actually monosyllables, but fifteen more seemed to be mere extensions or perversions of monosyllabic forms, and were classed with them. Of the remaining two hundred and seventy, sixty-two were recognized as loan-words, chiefly from the Pali. One hundred and sixty-eight were derived from monosyllabic originals—either reduplicates (which were discussed at some length), or compounds, or prefix-derivatives. Forty were undetermined. There are no suffixes or trace of inflection. The native core of the language is thus seen to be a mass of monosyllabic words, around which there is a scanty fringe of derivatives. All these words are invariable in form, and undifferentiated in function, save only as content may determine, or rather limit, function. They are, that is, of no Part of Speech, but are symbols of concepts merely, unmixed with tokens of syntactic function. The sentence is thus of the nominal or notional sort exclusively, and generally without copula. Syntax is reduced to the simplest formulas of sequence, corresponding closely with those of sign-language, as set forth by Wundt. The paper further touched upon the important part played by the verbal predicate in developing the Parts of Speech and the intricate syntax of Indo-European languages.

Discussion by Professors Merrill, Clapp, Nutting, Murray, and Messrs. Allen and Linforth.

#### 5. The Vowel *R* and the Coronal Vowels in English, by Professor Samuel A. Chambers, of the University of California.

*Definitions.*—A *vowel* is produced by a modified but unobstructed passage of the fundamental sound through the mouth; a *consonant*, by an obstruction of some kind, namely, occlusion, explosion, or friction. There is nothing absolute in these definitions, for there are sounds in which the obstruction is so slight that they are generally placed in a sub-class of consonants and called *liquids*. They are also called *semi-vowels*, and Sievers (*Grundzüge der Phonetik*, p. 84) says: "Der Unterschied zwischen den Vocalen und Liquidien ist sehr gering; er beruht lediglich auf einer verschiedenen Articulationsform der Zunge." This shifting

and intermediate character of the liquids has been confirmed experimentally by Rousselot (*Principes de Phonétique Experimentale*, p. 404 ff.) and by Scripture (*Elements of Experimental Phonetics*, pp. 432-433).

The *i* of *eat*, the *j* of *you*, and the *j* of *beyond*, emphatic, represent the *i*-sound as vowel, liquid, and consonant. *U* exists in its three stages in *soon*, *we*, and *we*, emphatic. In the same way *r* is vowel, liquid, and consonant in *sir*, *run*, and *run*, emphatic. In French there is a liquid, if not a consonant, form of the vowel *y* in *lui*, *puis*. Scripture adds, "Perhaps other vowels have liquid forms."

Vowels are produced from fricative consonants by opening the passage till the friction ceases. The consonant *r* is a buzzing produced by the tongue-tip being held close to the front palate. If the tongue is lowered till the friction ceases, the pure vowel *r* is produced. Compare the *r* of *red* and of *sir*. Vowels may be formed in the same way from other fricatives, *w*, *j*, *z*, *v*, but *z* and *v* produce one of the already existing obscure vowels.

*The R-sound.*—Sievers classes *r* among the *Sonoren* or pure-voiced sounds, and says that it differs from a vowel only in tongue-articulation; that of the vowels being *dorsal*, that of *r* being *coronal*. But later he discusses *r* as a consonant, which leads Viator (*Elemente der Phonetik*, p. 207) to accuse him of inconsistency. Viator follows tradition and classes *r* as a fricative consonant, but he adds that it differs in many respects from the other fricatives, especially in the fact that the narrowing may be very slight without the sound losing its characteristic resonance. It seems to me that neither Sievers nor Viator have reached "Das Wesen der Laute," the real nature of the *r*.

The essence of an *r* is undoubtedly its coronal character—a sound made by the upturned tip of the tongue, as it keeps its peculiar resonance whether as vowel, liquid, or consonant, alone or with other sounds. The typical *r* is probably the untrilled English fricative, as in *red*. The trilling is secondary, as a *b* may be trilled as well. But from long association this secondary characteristic has been taken as primary, and for the trilling of the tongue-tip that of the uvula has been substituted in probably more than half of France and Germany. The attempt to trill the back of the tongue leads to the guttural *r*. These are not *r*'s at all, but substitutes for it. Trilling is a kind of intermittent friction, hence these *r*'s are consonants.

*The English R.*—I. In North England *r* in all positions in the word is trilled, and is, therefore, always a consonant.

II. In West England and America *r* is a *consonant* when before a vowel.

It may have three positions:—

(a) Initial, as in *red*.

(b) Intervocalic, as in *very*.

(c) Between a consonant and a vowel, as in *dry*.

It is a *vowel* when,

(a) Before a consonant, as *bird* (brd), *heard* (hrd), *urgent* (rgnt).

(b) Final, as *sir* (sr), *poor* (pur), *butter* (butr).

III. In South England, London especially, the vowel *r* is weakened into some obscure vowel. Sweet calls it obscure *e*, and prints it as *ɜ* in his *Primer of Spoken English*. But Meyer (*Englische Lautdauer*, p. 8) doubts this, and says that in such expressions as *the cutter*, the *ɜ* of *er* seemed to him a lower, deeper sound than the *ɜ* of *the*.

In liaison, vowel *r* becomes a consonant. Compare *He is here, Here he is*. This liaison is made in London as well as in American English, which might indicate that Meyer's "lower, deeper sound" is caused by a sufficient upturning of the tip to depress the dorsal part of the tongue—a reminiscence of the *r*.

*The Vowel R*.—In the production of the consonant *r*, both the tip and the dorsum are raised, which leads Vietor to class *r* as a mixed sound—"das *r* ist hiernach ein 'gemischter' Laut" (p. 208). To be consistent, he must call it a mixed consonant, which is a doubtful classification.

The *mixed vowels* are produced by the tongue-position of one vowel and the lip-position of another; for instance, *y* from *i* and *u*. *R* is not formed in this way.

In the *pure vowels*, such as *i* or *a*, the oral passage is modified by the raising of the dorsum of the tongue. In the *r*-vowel the modification is made by the point, so that *r* is as pure a vowel as *i* or *a*.

*The Coronal Vowels*.—(a) If, when forming the vowels, we move back the velum so as to throw part of the voice through the nose, we get modifications of the original vowels,—mixed sounds which we call *nasal vowels*.

(b) If, when forming *i*, *e*, *ε*, *a*, we round the lips, we get modifications which we call *rounded vowels*.

(c) Likewise if, when forming the vowels, we turn up the tip of the tongue, we get modifications of the original vowels,—mixed sounds which we call *coronal vowels*.

Thus, *ε* may be nasalized to *ẽ*, rounded to *œ*, coronalized to *ẹ̃*.

The low vowels are coronalized with ease, as *a* in *far*, *u* in *fur*, *ε* or *æ* in *fair*, *o* in *for*; the others with difficulty, since the tip of the tongue must be raised without deranging the dorsum.

*R in Liaison*.—*I* and *a* in liaison add to themselves their corresponding consonant; e.g. *He* and *I* = *hiyndai*; *you* and *I* = *juwndai*. Vowel *r* also is followed by consonant *r*; e.g. *More* and *more* = *Morrmor*.

*R in Diphthongs*.—*R* forms *diphthongs* readily with other vowels, as *mere*, *mayor*, *mare*, *mar*, *for*, *four*, *moor*; these words all being monosyllables.

*R* forms *triphthongs* with *ai* and *au*. Thus, *air* in *fire*, *aur* in *flour*, *flower*. In poetry *flower* may be made a dissyllable; thus, *flaurior*.

In such words as *fear*, *poor*, and *mayor*, the union of the two vowels of the diphthongs seems loose, but there seems to be no doubt of the monosyllabic character of these words in ordinary speech. Compare *I* and *aye*. It does not seem necessary to consider that such words require glide vowels. I should write *fear* = *fir*, *poor* = *pur*, *mayor* = *mer* or *mer*.

Discussion by Professors Clapp, Matzke, and Richardson.

Adjourned at 5.15 P.M.

## SECOND SESSION.

The members of the Association came together again at 8 P.M. to listen to the address of the President, Professor Merrill.

On the Problem of Literary Influence as illustrated by the Relations of Horace to Lucretius.

The first part of this address was published in *The Latin Leaflet*, 1905, Vol. V, Nos. 119 and 120; the principal part is to be found in the *University of California Publications*, Classical Philology Series, Vol. I.

### THIRD SESSION.

The Session was called to order on Wednesday, December 28, at 9.30 A.M., by the second Vice-President, Professor E. B. Clapp.

The reading and discussion of papers was continued.

## 6. Notes on the Conspiracy of Catiline, by Professor H. C. Nutting, of the University of California.

### I. THE ATTEMPT TO MURDER CICERO AT HIS HOUSE.

The chronology of the events of the early part of November in the year 63 has provided a fertile theme for discussion. The aim of the earlier work<sup>1</sup> was mainly to establish the date of the delivery of the first speech against Catiline. Unfortunately at this time there was a tendency to discredit or manipulate what we learn directly from Cicero in favor of what Asconius seems to say; and the results of the earlier investigations have therefore been generally rejected, so far as the date of *in Cat. i* is concerned. But during the discussion of this point much of value was brought to light with reference to our present theme. Yet the excellence of this part of the work has received little recognition in our text-books, and it has therefore seemed worth while to restate the facts already brought to light, applying them to the correct date of *in Cat. i*, and adding some further suggestions.

From *p. Sulla* 18. 52 we learn that it was on the night of the 6th of November that Catiline slipped away from the house of M. Marcellus, where he was in nominal confinement, to preside at a meeting of the conspirators at the home of M. Laeca. The business transacted that night included the making of an arrangement whereby two Roman knights should visit Cicero under pretext of an early morning call, and, when admitted in this way, kill him in his bed. With scarcely an exception the text-books in common use state that the attempt to carry out this plan was made immediately after the meeting broke up, *i.e.* in the early morning hours of the 7th. Indeed, at first sight, this seems to be the meaning of *in Cat. i*, 4. 9: *confirmasti te ipsum iam esse exiturum; dixisti paulum tibi esse etiam nunc morae, quod ego viverem. Reperti sunt duo equites Romani qui te ista cura liberarent, et sese illa ipsa nocte paulo ante lucem me in meo lectulo interfecturos esse pollicerentur.*<sup>2</sup> The narrative then continues as though the original plan was carried out without change — *Haec ego omnia, vixdum etiam coetu vestro dimisso, comperi; domum meam maioribus praesidiis munivi atque firmavi; exclusi eos quos tu ad me salutatum miseras.*

If this were all that Cicero had to say upon the subject, we should not perhaps think of questioning the correctness of the general assumption that it was on the morning of the 7th that the attempt was made. But *in Cat. ii*, 6. 12 has a

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* Madvig, *Opusc.* I, 194 ff.; Mommsen, *Hermes*, I, 431 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the less explicit statement *p. Sulla*, 18. 52.

different story to tell. There, speaking of the delivery of *in Cat. i*, Cicero says — *Quid ? ut hesterno die, Quirites, cum domi meae paene interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iovis Statoris convocavi, rem omnem ad patres conscriptos detuli.* The plain and obvious sense of this passage is that the attempt on Cicero's life was made on the same day as that on which *in Cat. i* was delivered. But *in Cat. i* was not delivered on the 7th — it could not have been earlier than the 8th. For in it Cicero speaks several times of the night of the meeting at Laeca's house, using the terms *nox illa, nox prior, illa nox superior* — phrases which he could not have used until at least the second day after the meeting. We are therefore compelled to date *in Cat. i* as late as November 8,<sup>1</sup> and this seems to carry forward the attempt on Cicero's life to that day.

Those who hold to the earlier date suggest that in ii, 6. 12 *hesterno die* belongs only with *convocavi* and *detuli* (actions which took place on the 8th), whereas the subordinate clause *cum domi meae paene interfectus essem* refers to what happened a day earlier. This difficult interpretation is certainly a desperate expedient, and is apparently resorted to under the impression that i, 4. 9 definitely confirms the earlier date. But does it ?

Looking more carefully at the phrasing of that passage, it will be seen that it is not stated that the knights made the attempt on Cicero's life *illa ipsa nocte*, but that they *promised* to do so. It is therefore a mere assumption from the general tenor of the passage that puts the attempt on the morning of the 7th. That the assumption is a mistaken one seems clear even from the internal evidence of this very passage. For when we come to assign a time for all the events narrated as preceding the arrival of the conspirators at Cicero's house, it seems incredible that the men should have arrived when day had scarcely broken (*paulo ante lucem*) on the 7th.

For, in the first place, the meeting at Laeca's house must have convened at a late hour to avoid suspicion, and the session was doubtless a protracted one ; for we learn from the passage in hand of the important final business that was transacted with a view to Catiline's speedy departure from the city : *distribuisti partis Italiae ; statuisti quo quemque proficisci placeret ; delegisti quos Romae relinqueres, quos tecum educeres ; discrispisti urbis partis ad incendia, etc.* It goes without saying that a meeting of this sort was not a short one — we should not be surprised if it were protracted until nearly dawn. If so, by hastening at once to Cicero's house, the conspirators would scarcely arrive in time to be among the very first of the morning visitors, when the opportunity to kill Cicero would be most favorable.

If we assume that they did thus come before daylight on the 7th, where shall we find a place for the various things which happened before their arrival ? According to i, 4. 9 it was not until the meeting broke up that the news of the plot against his life was carried to Cicero. How much time was consumed in transmitting the message we do not know. Cicero, with characteristic boastfulness, to show how well he has the situation in hand, says that he was informed when the meeting had hardly been dismissed. But if the news came through the usual channel (Curius and Fulvia), some considerable time must be allowed for the transmission. After the news arrived, we are told that additional guards

<sup>1</sup> The argument against this date is weakened by the observation that Asconius reckons by both the English and the Roman methods, and that he is perhaps using the former (p. 6 Or.).

were called in to protect Cicero's house ; and, most interesting of all, at the end of the passage we learn that Cicero had interviews with many prominent citizens, telling the names of the would-be murderers and predicting the time of their coming (*cum illi ipsi venissent, quos ego iam multis ac summis viris ad me id temporis venturos esse praedixeram*).

It really strains the probabilities of the case seriously to bring all these events within a compass that would allow of the conspirators arriving before daylight on the morning of the 7th, and since Cicero says only that the knights *promised* to kill him *illa ipsa nocte*, the whole case for the earlier date is very weak, especially in view of the fact that in order to maintain it we must violently force the meaning of ii, 6, 12.<sup>1</sup> We therefore welcome the suggestion that the *plan* was made originally for the morning of the 7th, but that, because of the length of the meeting, the *execution* of the plan was postponed until the following morning. This would allow an interval of twenty-four hours for the news to reach Cicero, for him to call in additional guards, and have interviews with prominent men regarding the plot. It would also fit perfectly with the statement in ii, 6, 12, which clearly indicates that the attempt was made on the day on which *in Cat. i* was delivered, *i.e.* on the 8th.

Further confirmation for this later date is afforded by *in Cat. ii*, 6, 13. Here Cicero is relating to the people what he had said on the 8th when delivering *in Cat. i* before the senate : *quaesivi a Catilina in nocturno conventu ad M. Laecam fuisset necne. Cum ille . . . reticuisset, patefeci cetera ; quid ea nocte egisset, quid in proximam constituisset*. Cicero is manifestly taking up that part of *in Cat. i* in which 4, 9 falls. Referring back to that passage, it will be seen that after telling what business was transacted during the meeting at Laeca's house (*quid ea nocte egisset*), the very next thing mentioned is the plan made to murder Cicero. That this was the plan for the following night (*quid in proximam constituisset*) would be a natural assumption from a comparison of the two passages ; and this assumption grows to conviction when diligent search throughout the first oration against Catiline fails to bring to light a reference to any other plan for the night which followed that on which the meeting at Laeca's house took place.

There seems, therefore, to be no reasonable doubt that it was on the morning of the 8th that the actual attempt took place, but Cicero has not made it at all clear whether the *original plan* was for that morning or for that of the 7th. Of course, at first sight, i, 4, 9 seems to decide that question definitely in favor of the earlier date, for Cicero says that the knights *promised* to kill him *illa ipsa nocte*, which would naturally mean in the early morning hours of the 7th. But, as has already been noted, in this passage there is no hint of a postponement ; the narrative runs along as though, in arriving on the morning of the 8th, the conspirators were carrying out their original plan. And the wording of ii, 6, 13 (*quid in proximam constituisset*) also looks clearly in this direction.

This point is of minor importance, but it presents greater difficulty than the larger question discussed above. We might be tempted to suppose that Cicero had made a slight slip, were it not for the fact that he was speaking of events so recent, and that these speeches were carefully revised by him. A second

<sup>1</sup> Sallust's account (chap. xxxviii) is not explicit on this point, and is, of course, of no critical value.

alternative would be to suppose that Cicero has allowed himself to speak carelessly or awkwardly. Thus *illa ipsa nocte* might conceivably refer, not to the night of the meeting, but to the following night. For we might fancy that the meeting did not break up until dawn was streaking the east; if then, as the conspirators separated, the two emissaries should say "We will kill him this very night," they would mean the night following the day now breaking, *i.e.* the night between the 7th and the 8th. Quoting this speech indirectly, Cicero would say *illa ipsa nocte*. But such an interpretation is extremely hard, and is suggested only as a means of avoiding the last alternative, namely, that of supposing that we have to do with a corruption of the text of which the manuscripts give no hint.

2. *Huic sceleri obstat*, SALLUST, *B.C.* LII, 32.

This phrase occurs in Cato's speech delivered on the Nones of December, when the fate of the conspirators was hanging in the balance. The sentence in which it stands is ironical, as is shown by *videlicet*. There are in general two lines of interpretation:

(a) "Doubtless their past lives secure them from suspicion of this crime," *i.e.* of having conspired against the state. See Harper's *Lex.* and Hoffmann, *ad loc.* This interpretation would fit better *crimini huius sceleris* than *huic sceleri*.

(b) "Doubtless their past lives counterbalance this crime." So Jacobs-Wirz and Stegmann. The meaning assigned to *obstat* is unusual, but supported by Livy i, 26. 5.

There is a third possible interpretation that would assign to *obstat* its usual meaning. The spirit of Cato's speech is very different from that of Caesar; it fairly bristles with sarcasm, innuendo, and irony. In this passage he has cited the example of Torquatus, who ordered the execution of a son who persisted in fighting against the enemy when ordered to desist; and then he adds "And that splendid youth by his death paid the penalty for his unbounded bravery; are you in doubt as to the action you should take with reference to most wicked traitors?" He means, of course, that the death penalty should be passed on the prisoners; and I suggest that *huic sceleri* is an ironical reference to this proposed action. For Caesar, in his speech, had pointed out that to put to death a Roman citizen without a trial would be illegal; and so Cato says with bitterest irony, "Doubtless their past lives—their past good record—stands in the way of this outrage<sup>1</sup> (on our part)."

Discussion by Messrs. Martin and Allen.

7. The Derivation and Meaning of *Luscinia*, by Mr. E. W. Martin, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

To the Romans was *luscinia* the "dawn-singer" or the "grief-singer"? Discussion based on Professor E. W. Fay's article, "Studies of Latin Words in *-cinio*, *-cinia*. I. *Luscinia*,"—*Classical Review*, July, 1904.

<sup>1</sup> The choice of the term *scelus* in this connection is natural enough; cf. Cic. *in Verr.* ii, 5, 66. 170.



1. Derivation from \**lucēs*-, "dawn-singer." Weakness of the poetic citations. Improbability in view of reality and the records of the nightingale as a night-singer in ancient poetry and folklore.

2. Derivation from \**luges*-, "grief-singer," more probable in consideration of the word's semasiology. Evidence of (1) the myth; (2) epithets; (3) ancient and modern bird-lore; (4) nearly universal poetic feeling; (5) parallels.

Discussion by Professors Fairclough, Emerson, Matzke, Rice, and Dr. O'Connor.

Professor Merrill then took the chair.

8. A Plan for the Republication in a Revised Form of the Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in the Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, by Professor M. L. Margolis, of the University of California.

In giving the Hebrew-Aramaic equivalents, the editors, according to the explicit statement in the preface, have aimed at no final judgment in the sometimes very intricate questions of identification. Hence we very often find a mere *quid pro quo*, not to mention the obelized passages upon which the editors have refrained from all judgment. In the proposed revision it is intended to exclude erroneous identifications, to include new identifications, and to indicate, as well as to discuss, doubtful cases. There will be references to publications in which a certain identification has been proposed. The equivalents will be arranged in accordance with frequency. Under the simple verbs all the compounds will be given. The later translations will be dealt with each separately under each word. An index of Hebrew and Aramaic words will be found at the end. The proposed publication, which will give no quotations except in the case of words requiring discussion, will in nowise take the place of the larger work upon which it will be based, but rather supplement it, and pave the way for a new Lexicon of the Septuagint, which is a scientific *desideratum*.

Printed in full in *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXV (1905), 205-293.

Discussion by Professors Murray and Fairclough.

9. Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 817, and Secrecy in Voting in the Athenian Law Courts, Fifth Century B.C., by Professor J. T. Allen, of the University of California. Read by Professor Clapp in the author's absence.

The paper is published in the *Classical Review*, December, 1904, p. 456 *sqq.* (Vol. XVIII).

Discussion by Professors Emerson, Murray, Ferguson, Fairclough, and Clapp.

10. On Figures of Prosody in Latin, by Professor L. J. Richardson, of the University of California.

(1) The term *figure of prosody* defined and described. (2) Current classification of such figures. (3) A proposed classification. (4) Current terminology. (5) A proposed terminology.

Discussion by Professors Clapp, Fairclough, Murray, and Chambers.  
Adjourned at 12.50 P.M.

#### FOURTH SESSION.

The Association convened again at 2.30 P.M.

The Committee on Nomination of Officers reported through the Chairman, Professor Murray, the following list of nominations: —

*President*, J. Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

*Vice-Presidents*, E. B. Clapp, University of California.

H. R. Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

*Secretary-Treasurer*, L. J. Richardson, University of California.

*Executive Committee*, The above-named officers and

A. F. Lange, University of California.

J. E. Church, University of Nevada.

H. K. Schilling, University of California.

J. E. Matzke, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The report was accepted, and on motion of Professor Chambers the Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association for the gentlemen as nominated.

On motion of Professor Senger the Association passed a vote of thanks to the retiring Secretary-Treasurer for his services.

The Committee on Time and Place of the next Meeting reported through the Chairman, Professor Chambers, as follows: —

Your Committee have considered the suggestion of holding a special meeting during the coming summer in Portland, Oregon. They deem the plan not feasible.

They recommend that the next regular meeting be held as usual at Mark Hopkins Institute of Art in San Francisco, on December 27, 28, 29, 1905.

The report was accepted.

The reading and discussion of papers was then continued.

11. English Notes, by Professor Frederick M. Padelford, of the University of Washington.

The author being absent, the paper, through lack of time, was merely read by title. It is published in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*.

12. The Etymology of Mephistopheles, by Professor J. Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University.

This paper is published in the TRANSACTIONS. Discussion by Professors Schilling, Emerson, Senger, Bradley, and Clapp.

13. The Master Playwright of Wakefield, by Professor C. M. Gayley, of the University of California.

The paper discussed those portions of the Towneley Cycle, whether complete miracles or insertions, which are written in the nine-line stanza peculiar to this cycle. It derived the stanza from its more unwieldy predecessors of York, and attempted to show that in all probability the contributions in that stanza are by one writer. It presented the characteristics of his thought and style, and suggested other portions of the cycle, not in the nine-line stanza, which may be attributed to him.

The exposition appears as a whole in an article entitled "The Later Miracle Plays of England" in the *International Quarterly*, April, 1905.

14. The Figurative Expressions in the Works of Heinrich von Kleist, by Professor J. H. Senger, of the University of California.

The paper gave an account of the method of investigation and classification with respect to the objects used as tropes in the *complete* range of pictures employed by a poet, a process which may offer a more reliable method than the present subjective treatment used by critics to determine an author's position not only within the limits of his own literature, but also to establish with great precision his affinity to an author of another nation.

By means of the complete material of an author's literary utterances it is possible to obtain a personal equation which, by comparison with that of other writers, leads to what may be called the personal equation of a nation as expressed in its literature.

For the purpose of attaining the greatest objectivity the great masters choose expressions which, like musical sounds, have over- and undertones connecting with the objects present in the picture words. The *plastic* effect of an expression by words depends upon the fact that it immediately conveys the idea of its object; its *poetic* effect requires that the objectivity of the expression be accompanied by harmonious suggestions similar to the harmonics produced by aliquot parts of a vibrating string or column of air, of which we are rarely conscious, but which are essential to the beauty of the sound. Through these harmonious suggestions may ultimately be revealed the peculiar national quality of an author.

The forcible imagery of Heinrich von Kleist lends itself quite naturally to an analysis as proposed. Minde-Pouet in his treatise, *Heinrich von Kleist. Seine Sprache und sein Stil*. Weimar, 1897, treats Kleist's language and the style peculiar to him as regards grammar and the orthodox rhetoric. He deals but imperfectly with the author's imagery, although he tries to classify the images

employed. On little more than four octavo pages (pp. 167-171) he gives what might be called an index of word pictures, classified: animals, plants, metals, etc., merely stating the leading word and the corresponding passage. In this way he registers 205 passages, apparently merely those he has selected originally for grammatical and rhetorical reasons.

The 656 passages so far found contain 831 objects for classification. Of these the poems in the first volume of Zolling's edition contain 18 passages, Familie Schroffenstein 80, Variations in Familie Ghonorez 5, Zerbrochener Krug 24, Robert Guiskard Fragment 22, Amphitryon 55, Penthesilea 106, Käthchen von Heilbronn 77, Hermannsschlacht 75, Prinz von Homburg 42, the prose pieces of the fourth volume 36, the letters to Wilhelmine von Zenge 68, to his sister Ulrike 30, other letters 18.

The author explained his classification of Kleist's tropes as employed in the forthcoming publication of his treatise.

Discussion by Professor Bradley.

Professor Clapp took the chair.

#### 15. Romance Etymologies, by Professor Carl C. Rice, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

1. French *fléchir*, Old French *fleschir*, *fleschier*, "to bend." *Fleschier* < \**flexicāre* < *flexus* < *flectere*, "to bend." Phonetic development regular. The form in *-ir* is due to a change of conjugation.

2. Spanish *rosca*, "screw," *roscar*, "to furrow." *Rosca* is a postverbal from \**rōsicāre* < *rōsus* < *rōdere*, "to gnaw." Phonetic development regular: cf. *rascar*, "to scratch" < \**rāsicāre*, "to scratch." For the postverbal formation, cf. Italian *leva*, "lever," from *levare*, "to raise." For the sense-development, cf. English *bit*, i.e., "a biting instrument."

3. French *ruche*, "hive," *rouche*, "hull of a ship on the stocks," Old French *rusche*, Provençal *rusca*, Piedmontese and Lombard *rusca*, "bark," Comascan *ruscā*, "to scale off." *Ruscā* < \**rūspicare* < \**rūspīre*, "to scratch" (cf. Italian *ruspare*, "to scratch," and the rare Latin *ruspārī*, "to explore"). Sense-development: 1) "to scratch off," "to peel"; 2) "peel," "bark"; 3) "hive made of bark"; 4) "hive." The phonetic development assumed is certainly regular in French and Provençal territory, and appears to be regular everywhere.

4. Spanish *sesgo*, "oblique," *sesgar*, "to cut obliquely." *Sesgar* < \**sēsēcāre*, "to cut apart." Phonetic development regular. The adjective is a postverbal.

Discussion by Professors Noyes and Matzke.

#### 16. The Duration of English Vowels in Monosyllabic Words, by Dr. P. E. Goddard, of the University of California.

By employing monosyllabic words uttered separately, the complicating effects of accent and emphasis were avoided for the present. Rousselot tracings were made with the cylinder travelling at a speed of about 28 centimetres per second. The error in making and measuring these tracings need not exceed .01 second.

The results first given are from records made and tabulated by a man about thirty years of age, who has lived all his life in the Rocky Mountain region. He held, at the time, the popular notions concerning vowel lengths.

First, words having the same initial and final consonants were compared. The differences in length were very small, indicating that English vowels and diphthongs have the same duration under the same phonetic conditions. The so-called long vowel or diphthong in *mate* is no longer than the vowels in *mat* or *met*.

Next, the same and other words were arranged so that their vowels and initial sounds were the same, but their final sounds varied as surds and sonants. The average length of the vowels preceding voiced consonants was .393 second, and of the same vowels preceding unvoiced consonants of the same kind .286 second, a difference of .107 second, or 38 per cent.

A table made from the author's speech shows that vowels before unvoiced consonants, voiced consonants, and without consonant endings, have the ratios of 100 : 140, and 100 : 175.

<i>A</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>B</i>		<i>A</i> <i>B</i>		<i>A</i> <i>B</i>	
bay . . .	.544 .579	bait. . .	.333 .368	bayed . . .	.398 .456
bow . . .	.561 .491	boat . . .	.333 .316	bode . . .	.398 .439
me . . .	.526 .491	meat . . .	.253 .351	mead . . .	.398 .439
he . . .	.491 .561	heat . . .	.281 .298	heed . . .	.414 .421
rye. . .	.684 .649	right . . .	.368 .288	ride . . .	.564 .516
fry . . .	.597 .597	fright . . .	.368 .288	fried . . .	.558 .439
pea . . .	.439 .421	piece . . .	.263 .193	peas . . .	.498 .376
fay . . .	.491 .491	fate . . .	.263 .263	fade . . .	.414 .379
sigh . . .	.632 .561	sight . . .	.263 .263	sighed . . .	.457 .439
lay . . .	.632 .527	late . . .	.333 .355	lade . . .	.498 .368
may . . .	.579 .527	mate . . .	.246 .256	made . . .	.515 .368
rue . . .	.561 .491	root . . .	.351 .267	rude . . .	.457 .456
ray . . .	.561 .597	rate . . .	.421 .404	raid . . .	.564 .551
lie . . .	.649 .579	light . . .	.368 .368	lied . . .	.531 .421
her. . .	.474 .459	hurt . . .	.298 .281	heard . . .	.464 .404
spur . . .	.439 .368	spurt . . .	.281 .281	spurred . . .	.464 .333
Average . . .	.551 .524		.314 .310		.469 .425
Per cent . . .	175 169		100 100		147 137

Adjourned at 5.45 P.M.

# FIFTH SESSION.

The Fifth Session was called to order by the first Vice-President, Professor Goebel, at 9.30 A.M., on Thursday, December 29.

The Committee appointed to examine the Treasurer's Report

<sup>1</sup> The results under *A* were obtained by speaking the words according to their vertical position, and those under *B* in their horizontal order.

announced through the Chairman, Professor Margolis, that the books had been examined and found correct.

Report accepted.

17. The Corréption of Diphthongs and Long Vowels in Hiatus, in Greek Hexameter Poetry, by Professor Edward B. Clapp, of the University of California. This paper will appear in full in the *Publications in Classical Philology of the University of California*.

This conspicuous feature in Greek hexameter poetry is difficult to explain. Two questions must be answered: first, why was the diphthong or long vowel treated as short? and, second, why was hiatus, under these circumstances, regarded as justifiable? The most satisfactory answer is that proposed by Hartel and by Grulich, which is based on the fact that in Homer more than 80 per cent of all cases of corréption occur in diphthongs consisting of a *short* vowel followed by *ι* or *υ*, which may be called the short diphthongs. Assuming that the practice originated in these short diphthongs, the explanation is easy. Before a word beginning with a vowel the final *ι* or *υ* of the diphthong would easily change to the corresponding consonant, thus removing hiatus, and the first vowel of the diphthong, standing alone, would show its natural short quantity.

The present paper is based on a study of this practice through the whole range of hexameter poetry, from Homer to Tryphiodorus, including about thirty poets. It was felt that if the corréption should show a tendency to *spread* from the diphthongs mentioned above to the long diphthongs and the simple long vowels, this fact would afford a strong confirmation of the truth of the views of Hartel and Grulich as to the origin of the practice.

But the result of the investigation points in the opposite direction. Far from showing a tendency to spread, and to affect all diphthongs and long vowels with approximate equality, corréption in the later poets tends to confine itself more and more strictly to the short diphthongs, and especially to *-αι* and *-ου*. These two diphthongs alone furnish 98 per cent of all cases of corréption in Tryphiodorus, in contrast to 90 per cent in Oppian, 85 per cent in Callimachus, and 78 per cent in Homer.

This result leaves the main question still in doubt, the views of Hartel and Grulich receiving no additional confirmation from the investigation here reported.

Discussion by Professors Richardson and Noyes.

18. Notes on Horace, *Sat.* 1. 6. 126, and Aristophanes, *Peace*, 990, by Professor J. Elmore, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

1. HOR. *Sat.* 1. 6. 126, *fugio campum lusumque trigonem*.

In *lusumque trigonem* — the much-discussed reading of Cruquius' *Blandinius vetustissimus* — we should recognize the characteristically Augustan usage of the participle in agreement with a substantive to express the abstract idea of action. The phrase thus means, not the "game of ball" (where *lusum* = *ludum*) nor "the ball game I have already played," but "the playing of the ball game," — "I leave behind me the campus and the ball-playing."

This use of the participle is frequent in Horace. Among the examples are the following: *Car.* 1. 1. 4; 1. 3. 29; 1. 5. 6; 1. 8. 12; 1. 36. 9; 2. 4. 10; 2. 9. 10; 2. 13. 31; 3. 6. 29; 3. 15. 10. *Sat.* 2. 1. 67; 2. 1. 84. *Eph.* 1. 16. 42. Of these cases *Car.* 1. 5. 6, 2. 9. 10, and 2. 13. 31 have the participle and its substantive in the accusative of the direct object, as in the present passage. Cf. *Liv.* 2. 36. 6 and *Mart.* 2. 75. 2. It is also proper to have this construction with the participle of *ludere*, which is often construed with an accusative of the so-called inner object. (So by Horace in *Sat.* 2. 3. 248.)

This interpretation avoids the necessity of regarding *lusum* as a concrete substantive — a late and rare use, and involving here the harsh apposition of *trigonem* — or of taking it in the ordinary sense of the participle. The latter places an undue emphasis on the completion of the action, as if it were only at the end of the game, and for this reason, that Horace took his departure. It is also unnecessary to assume, as both of these interpretations do, that Horace himself, in spite of his expressed distaste for it (*Sat.* 1. 5. 49), made ball-playing a part of his daily routine. The expression is a perfectly general one, not referring to any particular person or game. There were, doubtless, several of these games going on at the same time, and Horace may very well have been engaged in his favorite occupation of looking on.

This view of *lusumque trigonem* gives excellent sense, and the whole sentence with its combination of concrete and abstract in the same clause has a peculiarly idiomatic turn, reminding one of the similar combinations of *metaque . . . Evitata rotis* in *Car.* 1. 1. 4, and of *fidem* and *Mutatoque deos* in *Car.* 1. 5. 6.

2. ARISTOPH. *Peace*, 989-990: οἱ σου πρυχόμεθ' ἥδη  
τῖλα καὶ δέκ' ἔτη.

Aristophanes (*Achar.* 266) accepts 431 as the beginning of the war with Sparta, and the *Peace*, according to the generally accepted statement of the first hypothesis, was brought out in 421. Hence the chronological difficulty remarked by the scholiast and insisted on by the editors. This difficulty has been met in three ways, — by assuming a second production of the play in 418, by supposing that Aristophanes is referring to the preliminary hostilities between Corcyra and Corinth, and by emending the text. It is possible that there was a second performance of the *Peace* in 418, but Thucydides (5. 75) counts the whole period 421-416 as among the years of the war. As to the second explanation, the first battle between Corcyra and Corinth took place in 435 and the second in 432. The year required is 434, but there is no apparent reason for dating the beginning of the war from this year. Reviewing the whole question, Van Herwerden is inclined to believe that the text is unsound, though in his opinion no convincing correction has been proposed.

Before giving up the text there is another possibility that may be considered, — that Aristophanes is here using *τῖλα καὶ δέκα* as an indefinite number. There are three other passages where he unmistakably employs the number in this sense, — *Plut.* 194, 845, and 1083. In the second example we have the precise phrase *ἔτη τῖλα καὶ δέκα*. Other passages showing the same use are Homer *E* 387, Bacchylides 10. 192, and Herodotus 1. 119. 6. To be noted also is the statement attributed to Chares by Gellius (5. 2. 2) that Alexander's steed was bought

for thirteen talents. Compare also the use of *terdecies* as an indefinite number in Juv. 14. 28.

In the passage in the *Peace* there is no apparent difficulty in seeing the same usage. Trygaeus is under no compulsion, artistic or otherwise, to speak with literal accuracy, while the use of popular expressions quite befits his character. In his address to *Peace* he merely desires to convey the idea that she has been absent a long time. The fact that thirteen is near the actual number (ten) which historical accuracy requires, is no objection, since, as König has pointed out, the approximation—real or imagined—to the definite number is usually a characteristic of the indefinite one.

#### Discussion by Professors Clapp and Nutting.

19. A Study of the Forms of Interrogative Thought in Plato, by Professor H. R. Fairclough, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

This study, made for the new Plato Lexicon, aims at classifying the various interrogative idioms in Plato, summarizing their uses and showing their relative frequency, their variety of meaning, and their bearing upon the question of the authenticity of the doubtful dialogues.

The paper, when completed, will be published in full in the Lexicon referred to.

20. Sources of the Lay of Yonec, by Professor Oliver M. Johnston, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

A comparison of the lay of *Yonec* with the other stories containing similar motives shows that the lay represents a fusion of the legend of the *Jealous Stepmother* and of the well-known tale bearing the name *Inclusa*. The motive for combining these two stories doubtless lay in the desire of the minstrels, or the story-tellers from whom Marie de France heard the lay, to substitute a supernatural for a natural means of reaching the imprisoned lady. The first part of the story of the *Inclusa*, the theme, according to which a jealous old man has a young and beautiful wife whom he confines in a tower, was used in the lay. On the other hand, the second part of the *Inclusa*, where a handsome youth visits by means of an underground passage a lady imprisoned in a tower, is not contained in Marie's lay. However, the author of Marie's original substituted for the motive of the underground passage the theme of the *Jealous Stepmother*, where the lover assumes the form of a bird in order to reach the lady.

21. Direct Speech in Lucan as an Element of Epic Technic, by Dr. J. W. Basore, of the University of California.

An investigation of the speeches of the *Pharsalia* in point of (1) form, (a) monologue, (b) speech-scenes involving address and reply, (c) single speeches, and (2) their relation to the action and plot of the poem, to estimate by comparison with Vergil's usage of the speech as a naïve form of expression (Heinze, *Vergils Epische Technik*, Leipzig, 1903, pp. 396 ff.), the independent character of Lucan's epic methods. By reason of a certain crude power and the originality



of a sententious though declamatory style, Lucan has been assigned freely in ancient estimate a place among older writers of established reputation (cf. Martial, vii, 22; i, 61; vii, 21; vii, 23; x, 64; Tac. *Dial.* 20; Quint. x, 1. 90; Stat. *Silv.* ii, 7; Chaucer, *H. of Fame*, iii, 400). It did not, however, remain for the more discriminating judgment of modern taste to discover that he had produced not an epic, but a history in verse (cf. e.g. Dryden, *pref. Annus Mir.* with Petr. 118; Serv. *Aen.* i, 382). But this verdict of his failure has been drawn rather from the character of his subject-matter and style than from analysis of his epic form in which, by even superficial comparison with others of the later school, he is seen to be the most unconventional. Direct speech figures conspicuously in the *Aeneid* as a part of Vergil's artful imitation of the realistic spirit of the Homeric epic, and, consciously or unconsciously, he must have been Lucan's model for what he conceived to be an epic manner. Technically a monologue may be either a speech uttered alone to an imaginary hearer, or a soliloquy, i.e. a self-address in a similar situation. The form is essentially dramatic, and not epic. The clearest dramatic type is that in which the conflict of opposing inclinations is depicted, with the final victory of one which serves to motivate action. This may be illustrated from Homer, *Il.* x, 99 ff., and Dido's soliloquy in Vergil, iv, 534 ff. Lucan shows it not at all. He has used more freely than Vergil (cf. *Aen.* i, 37 ff.) the form which gives a psychological characterization of the individual in a given situation (cf. e.g. ii, 522 ff.; iv, 702 ff.; viii, 622 ff.), and is most free in the use of the characteristic type of Vergil, involving an address to an imaginary hearer, animate or inanimate (cf. e.g. v, 521 ff.; vi, 241 ff.). In introducing such he has avoided wholly the artless recurrence of stock phrase found in Homer and adopted by Vergil. Note the studied variants at i, 247; ii, 521 f.; iv, 701; viii, 621; often simple *ait* is used (cf. ii, 38; iii, 38) or *dixit, inquit, fatur*, etc. (e.g. v, 654; v, 521; iii, 90), or verb of saying is omitted (cf. ix, 989; ii, 493). Vergil has employed within much narrower lines than Homer the device of introducing into a given scene speakers involved in a lengthy series of address and reply (Heinze, *l.c.* 397 ff.), and this tendency to restrict the elaboration of speech-scenes is more marked in Lucan. In only one instance does he group more than two speakers, and only twice exceeds the limits of simple address and reply (cf. iii, 123 ff.; ix, 123 ff.; v, 130 ff.). The other speeches of the poem represent groups involving mere dialogue situations or single addresses, and require no emphasis here as being in no way characteristic. In discussing the relation of the speeches to the plot of the poem, further detailed comparison with Vergil will not be possible. To treat epically a historical event of recent occurrence is an impossibility, for invention and imagination are confined within the limits of the literally true. In the attempt Lucan finds scope for imagination by devising for his characters in definite situations, set harangues which they might have delivered. His manner in these, therefore, is that of the pragmatic historian. Though characteristically the speeches of Lucan are not integral to the narrative and seem to serve as mere halting places for declamation, it is possible to discover in his usage some marks of epic treatment. It may be noted, as in the older epic, that they are introduced in emotional situations as the vehicle of anger, sorrow, fear, joy, and the like, and with an effort at epic realism are usually duly tagged as such (cf. i, 192; ii, 44, 493; iv, 701, *et saepe*).

Aristotle (*Poet.* 34) has laid emphasis upon  $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$  as an essential of epic narrative, and, though Lucan is often led astray by windy declamation, it is clear that many of his speeches are introduced for purposes of characterization. To illustrate, the speech of Brutus to Cato (ii, 242 ff.) is pointed by 234 f., *At non magnanimi percussil pectora Bruti | terror*, as an effort to portray his undaunted courage amidst the alarm of Caesar's approach. Cato, in ix, 256 ff., is shown in calm dignity nerving his comrades to a struggle without hope; in 505 ff., his words reveal his endurance in physical suffering; in ii, 512 ff., the speech of Domitius in captivity marks his haughty contempt and high-born courage. A second comprehensive group is more directly concerned with the narrative in motivating action (cf. e.g. i, 273 ff.; ii, 483 ff.; vii, 68 ff.); others amplify the situation by the introduction of vivid detail. I cite, e.g., viii, 172 ff., where the pilot discourses to Pompey about the stars in the silence of the night upon the sea, so in ix, 176 ff., Caesar, after feasting, seeks to prolong the night in familiar discourse to the priest of Isis. Finally may be shown a type which usually, in the form of the *cohortatio*, is wholly extraneous to the narrative in subject-matter and purpose (cf. e.g. vii, 342 ff.; ix, 379 ff., *et sacpe*). As a result of the analysis thus outlined, it may be observed that in the forms of direct speech Lucan approximates Vergilian usage most nearly in the free employment of monologue; he observes the restrictions set by Vergil in avoiding the introduction of elaborate speech-scenes, employing in fairly equal proportions monologue and groups involving dialogue situations, while single speeches are far more numerous. In subject-matter the speeches are characteristically non-essential to the development of the narrative, though serving somewhat to characterize, to motivate action, or to supply picturesque detail. Though Lucan's art is that of the historian, his spirit and style that of the orator, he has used the speech as the expression of emotion with some consciousness of its epic fitness, but in no case may be said to reproduce the Vergilian simplicity.

22. Examples of French as Spoken by Englishmen in Old French Literature, by Professor J. E. Matzke, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

The paper made a study of four instances in Old French literature intended to represent the speech of an Englishman using French: (1) Renart as an English jongleur (*Roman de Renart*, ed. Martin, I, 62 ff.); (2) The *Fabliau de deux Angloys et de l'anel* (ed. Montaiglon et Raynaud, II, 178 ff.); (3) The Duke of Gloucester in *Jehan et Blonde* of Philippe de Beaumanoir (ed. Suchier); (4) Various characters in the *Mystère de Saint-Louis* (ed. Fr. Michel).

The following two papers were read by title:—

23. Old Problems in Horace and Vergil, by Professor J. E. Church, Jr., of the University of Nevada.

(a) Horace, *Carm.* i, 3. 1-8.

A reply to PAPA. xxxiv, xxii, based on Bücheler, *Carm. Lat. Epigr.* 196, 197, 198, 215; Tibullus, i, 4. 1-3, etc.

(b) Vergil, *Aeneid*, i, 249 . . . placida compostus pace quiescit.

The evidence of burial inscriptions favorable to the theory that this verse refers to the rest of Antenor in the tomb is weak, while the evidence of the *Aeneid* itself (i, 241 f., iii, 393, 495 f.) and the use of *placidaque . . . morte* (not *pace*) *quievit* (ix, 445) strongly support the generally accepted belief that Vergil is here referring to the peaceful retirement of Antenor after a strenuous life.

(c) Vergil's Use of the Proper Names of the Winds in the *Aeneid*.

Vergil employed the proper names *Aquilo*, *Eurus*, etc., as he did the general, *aura*, *turbo*, etc., not to designate the direction of the air current, but the condition of the weather. In his use of proper names for rhetorical effect Vergil resembles Horace, but is less extreme. The theory that Vergil used the proper names of the winds interchangeably is not supported by the evidence.

#### 24. The Name of the Slave in Plautus's *Aulularia*, by Professor H. W. Prescott, of the University of California.

The slave in Plautus's *Aulularia* is called Strobilus consistently in the text, and, with one exception, in the scene-headings. In the first part of the play the slave is the property of Megadorus; in the second part he is the slave of Lyconides, nephew of Megadorus, and perhaps a member of Megadorus's household. Immediately following the scenes of the first part is a monologue apparently spoken by the same slave Strobilus who is active in the preceding scenes, but the scene-heading of this monologue in the Palatine Mss. gives his name as FITODICVS, itself corrupt, but perhaps standing for Pythodicus.

Various methods of reconciling the difficulties have been proposed: (1) The theory of *retractatio* is acceptable only as a last resort; (2) Pythodicus may be substituted, without offence to the metre, for Strobilus, either in the first part of the play (Dziatzko, Leo), or in the second part (Le Breton). The former substitution destroys the effective alliteration in vs. 334; the latter is unlikely because the only evidence for Pythodicus occurs in the first part of the play.

A third solution has most in its favor: the names in the scene-headings of the Palatine Mss. are thought to have no independent value, but to be derived in all cases from the text itself. The corrupt scene-heading FITODICVS, then, probably arose from a corruption in the text of the play, not necessarily of the name Strobilus, but of some phrase or word occurring in a speech addressed to Strobilus, as Stalcio in the *Casina* from *staltio* (347) and *sta ilico* (955). The name Strobilus should be read throughout: parallel cases of one slave serving two masters in the same household have already been quoted by Dziatzko.

The Association adjourned at 12.15 P.M.

At the meeting of the Executive Committee the following two new members were admitted:—

Mr. Monroe E. Deutsch, San Francisco, Cal.

Mr. C. F. Schmutzler, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

# INDEX.

Arabic numerals indicate pages of the *Transactions*; Roman numerals indicate pages of the *Proceedings*.

- Abbadia del Fiume, Etruscan necropolis: lviii ff.  
 Accent, Greek: 65, 66, 74.  
 Accent, Latin: 65 ff.; of adjectives: 48-49; of conjunctions: 34-36; of pronouns: 36-48.  
 Accent and ictus, in late Latin hexameters: x f. (cf. lxx).  
 Acute accent: 67 ff., 70 ff.  
 Aeschylus, *Agam.* 817: lxxxvii.  
 Alchemy: lxii.  
 ἀλλοιωσις, problem of, in pre-Socratics: xiv.  
 ἄλοχος in Homer: lxxv ff.  
 Alphabetic notation of variant sounds: xxii.  
 Amulets: 87, 89, 104-106, 108, 119, 120, 122.  
 Aristophanes, *Peace*, 990: xcii ff.  
 Art, influence of, on Vergil: lxix.  
 Atharva-Veda, criticism of: xxi; Çāntikalpa of: 77 ff.  
 Athenian courts: lxxxvii.  
 Athenian politics (early third century B.C.): lxxix.  
 Athens, economics of building: 12 ff.; transportation: 17.  
 Beneventum, arch of Trajan: xiv ff.  
 Çāntikalpa: 77-127.  
 Cassiodorus, and Livy: xvi.  
 Catiline, conspiracy of: lxxxiii ff.  
 Catullus, lxviii, 93, critical note on: vii ff.  
 Chinese drama: lv ff.  
 Cicero, *comitia* and *concilium* in: 22 ff.  
 Cicero, in *Cat.*: lxxxiii ff.  
 Cicero, on Latin accent: 66, 70.  
 Circumflex accent: 68-70.  
*comitia* and *concilium*, distinction between: 21-32; rule of Laelius Felix unknown to Livy: 21; to republican period: 22-26; new generalizations: 26-29; their explanation: 29-32.  
 Conjunctions, occasional oxytonesis of, in Latin: 34-36.  
 Corneille, *Horace*, sources of: lxix.  
*cretati pedes*: lxxiv.  
 Crete, language of: xxix f.  
 Dictionary, Latin, suggestions for a new: xxxiv ff.  
 Direct speech in Lucan: xciv ff.  
 Donatus on Latin accent: 71-73, 75.  
 English, in America: ix.  
 English etymology (seventeenth century): lxx.  
 Etruscan tombs (near Pitigliano): lviii ff.  
 Etruscans: xxx.  
*fléchir*, etymology of: xc.  
 French, as spoken by Englishmen in Old French literature: xcvi.  
 Goethe, Faust, Cabala and alchemy in: lxii.  
 Grammatical myths: xxiv ff.  
 Grave accent: 67, 69, 71.  
 Guilds, Rome: 18 f.  
 Hermes Trismegistos: 152.  
 Hexameters, accent and ictus in (late Latin): x f.  
 Hexameters, correption in (Greek): xcii.  
 Hiatus, Greek: xliii; xcii.  
 Hiatus in Greek Melic poetry: lxiii f.  
 Hittites: xxviii.  
 Homer, Hades and the dead in: xiii.  
 Homer, *Iliad*, i, 291, critical note on: xlii f.; ix, 334-343: lxxv ff.  
 Horace, as a poet of nature: v ff.  
 Horace and Lucretius: lxxxii.  
 Horace, imitation of Ovid: *Carm.* iv. 1. 16 and *Am.* ii. 12. 28; *Epist.* i. 8. 3 and *Am.* i. 11. 13: 136-147.

- Horace, *Carm.* i. 3. 1-8: xcvi.  
 Horace, *Sat.* i. 6. 126: xcii f.  
 House, ceremony for protection of: 88, 107, 121.  
 Iambic words, how far oxytone in Latin: 58-59.  
 Ictus: 73.  
 Illyrians: xxxi f.  
 Indo-European languages, minor and problematic: xxvii ff.  
 Juvenal i, construction of: lxxi ff.  
 Kleist, figurative expressions in: lxxxix f.  
 Laelius Felix on *comitia* and *concilium*: 21, 26, 31.  
 Latin, Gallic clerical, pronunciation of: lxiv f.  
 Lemnos, language of: xxx.  
 Ligurian: xxxiii f.  
 Livy, *comitia* and *concilium* in: 21, 28 f.  
 Livy, Oxyhynchus epitome: xvi.  
 Livy, third dec., Puteanus group of MSS.: xlv.  
 Lucan, direct speech in: xciv ff.  
 Lucretius, influence on Vitruvius: xvi ff.  
 Lucretius and Horace: lxxxii.  
 Lucretius and Memmius: lxii.  
*lusciniā*, derivation of: lxxxvi f.  
 Lycians: xxix.  
 Mahācānti: 78-80, 83, 86-89, 101-109, 117-122.  
 Mephistopheles, etymology of: 148 ff.  
 Mephistophil: 151.  
 Messapian: xxxii f.  
 Metaphor, lexical treatment of: xxxiv ff.  
 Metric, new, a quantitative difficulty in: xliii.  
 Metric, Latin, studies in: 43-48.  
 Mommsen on *comitia* and *concilium*: 22 f., 31, n. 1.  
 Motion in pre-Socratic cosmogonies: xiv.  
 Musical accent: 66 ff.  
 Nakṣatrakalpa: 78-83.  
 Nakṣatrayāga: 81-83, 92-100, 109-116.  
 Nature, in Horace: v ff.  
 Nirṛtikarman: 84-86, 101, 116-117.  
 Numeral systems, California languages: lxix f.  
 Obsequens, and Livy: xvi.  
 Ὀφελῆς: 149.  
 Ophiel: 152.  
 Optative: iv f.  
 Ōschirqs (ὠσχιρῆς): 156.  
 Ovid, imitated by Horace: *Am.* i. 11. 13 and *Epist.* i. 8. 3: 140; *Am.* ii. 12. 28 and *Carm.* iv. 1. 16: 136-147.  
 Ovid, allusive reminiscences of Horace: 143 f.  
 Ovid, Harvard manuscript of *Heroides* xxi. 1-144: 128-136 ff.  
 Pariṣṭas of the Atharva-Veda: 79-81, 84-87.  
 Perfect active, Greek, rarity of forms of imperative, optative, and subjunctive: xxiv ff.  
 Pericles, his building policy: 5-20.  
 Philosophy, early Greek: xiv (*bis*).  
 Pitch, musical, in language: 66.  
*πλάσμα*, use of, in poetical recitation: 58, 61 n., 64 n.  
 Plato, forms of interrogative thought in: xciv.  
 Plato, *Rep.* vii, simile of the cave: xxii.  
 Plautus, concessive *si*-clauses in: liv.  
 Plautus, *Aul.*, name of slave in: xcvi.  
 Pliny, Jr., date of governorship of Bithynia: xliii.  
 Plutarch, method in biography: 8 ff.  
 Plutarch, *Pericles*, 12: 5-20.  
 Poetry, ancient, song-like recitation of: 53-57; effect of this upon quantity and word-accent: 57-60.  
*πρὸμαρρελα*, meaning of: xi ff.  
 Pronouns, frequent oxytonesis of, in Latin: 36-48.  
 Prosody, figures of (Latin): lxxxviii.  
 Pulci, Luigi: lxxxix f.  
 Quantity, affecting accent: 70.  
 Quintilian on Latin accent: 70, 72.  
*Quod*-clauses, restrictive, subjunctive in: lv.  
*R*, vowel, in English: lxxx ff.  
 Ritschl's theory of the influence of the accent upon Latin verse-forms: 62; merits and defects of this theory: 63-64.  
 Rome, building guilds at: 18 f.  
*rosca*, etymology of: xc.  
*ruche*, etymology of: xc.  
 Sallust, B.C., lii. 32: lxxxvi.  
 Segolates, plural of: liii f.  
 Septuagint, Oxford Concordance to: lxxxvii.  
*sesgo*, etymology of: xc.  
*Si*-clauses, concessive, in Plautus: liv.

- Siamese vocabulary: lxxx.  
 Sophocles, *Ajax*, 186: iv ff.  
 Sophocles, *Antigone*, parodos of: lxxv ff.  
 Subjunctive, Latin, second singular indefinite, as mood of statement: xxvii.  
*Suppletivwesen*, Latin: xxxvii ff.  
 Tabula smaragdina: 154.  
*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, proposed supplement: xxii ff.  
 Thracio-Phrygian: xxx f.  
 τῶνος, 'musical mode,' 'melody': 53 n., 56, 64 n.  
 Toth: 152.  
 Trajan, arch of, Beneventum: xiv ff.  
 Vari, cave at: xxii.  
 Venetian: xxxii.  
 Vergil, *Aen.* i. 249: xcvi f.
- Vergil, influence of art on: lxix.  
 Vergil, wind-names in: xcvi.  
 Verse-ictus, problem of in ancient poetry: 50; ancient testimonies upon: 51-53; relation to word-accent in Latin: 60-64.  
 Vitruvius, and Lucretius: xvi ff.  
 Vowels, correption of (Greek) in hiatus: xcii.  
 Vowels, coronal, in English: lxxx ff.  
 Vowels, duration of English, in monosyllables: xc f.  
 Wakefield, master playwright of: lxxxix.  
 Word-accent in Latin verse: x ff., lxx.  
 Yonac, sources of the lay of: xciv.  
 Zabulon (diabolus): 156.

# BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RECORD.

JULY 1, 1903, to JULY 1, 1904.

The Bibliographical Record, which is at best a very incomplete summary of the work of the members, aims to include not only publications that are distinctly philological in character, but also those that deal with the educational aspects of the study of language and literature. The Record is intended to contain only such publications as have appeared within the above-mentioned year.

ABBREVIATIONS: *AHR* = American Historical Review; *AJA* = American Journal of Archaeology; *AJP* = American Journal of Philology; *AJSL* = American Journal of Semitic Languages; *AJT* = American Journal of Theology; *Archiv* = Archiv für latein. Lexicographie; *Bookm.* = The Bookman; *CR* = Classical Review; *CSCP* = Cornell Studies in Classical Philology; *ER* = Educational Review; *HSCP* = Harvard Studies in Classical Philology; *HSPL* = Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature; *IF* = Indogermanische Forschungen; *JAOS* = Journal of the American Oriental Society; *JBL* = Journal of Biblical Literature; *JGP* = Journal of Germanic Philology; *JHUC* = Johns Hopkins University Circulars; *MLA* = Publications of the Modern Language Association; *MLN* = Modern Language Notes; *Nat.* = The Nation; *NW* = The New World; *PAPA* = Proceedings of the American Philological Association; *SR* = School Review; *TAPA* = Transactions of the American Philological Association; *UPB* = University of Pennsylvania Bulletin; *WRUB* = Western Reserve University Bulletin.

## FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

The Toledo manuscript of the Germania of Tacitus; *University of Chicago Decennial Publications*, first series, vol. vi., 215-259.

## ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY.

Recent literature on the New Testament; *AJT.*, viii. (April, 1904), 405-412.

## SIDNEY G. ASHMORE.

A plea for the classics in our schools, with particular reference to Latin; *Union University Quarterly*, May, 1904, i., 30-46.

## FRANCIS M. AUSTIN.

Cacophony in Juvenal, Horace, and Persius; *AJP.*, xxiv., 452-455.

## WILLIAM W. BAKER.

The Greek comic poets as literary critics; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), p. xxxiv.  
*Quandō-quidem* or *quandō-quidem*; *CR.*, xvii., 313-316.

## PHILLIPS BARRY.

The ballad of Lord Randal in New England; *Journal of American Folk-lore*, xvi., 258-264.

## J. EDMUND BARSS.

Writing Latin (bk. ii., third and fourth year work), pp. 171; New York: University Publishing Co., 1903.

Latin requirements for Harvard and for Yale; *Latin Leaflet*, iv., No. 83.

The proper ratio between reading and writing in the study of Latin; *Ib.*, No. 92.

## SAMUEL ELIOT BASSETT.

The cave at Vari: terra-cotta lamps; *AJA.*, vii. (1903), 338-349.

## WILLIAM N. BATES.

Iphigenia in Tauris, edited with an introduction, notes, and critical appendix (The American Book Co.); also text edition.

Scenes from the Aethiopis on a black-figured amphora; *Trans-*

*actions of the Department of Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania*, vol. i., 45 ft.

PAUL BAUR.

Review of Gardner's Ancient Athens; *CR.*, Feb., 1904.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Cicero, selected orations; Boston, 1904.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

On some alleged Indo-European languages in cuneiform character; *AJP.*, xxv., 1-14.

Cerberus, the dog of Hades; *The Monist*, xiv., 523-540.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

The story of Rome as Greeks and Romans tell it: an elementary source-book, pp. xii + 328; New York: The Macmillan Co. [With Lillie Shaw Botsford.]

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

Concerning the unwritten history of the Modern Language Association of America; *MLA.*, xviii., xlii-lxii.

Brief mention of books: March's Thesaurus dictionary of the English language; *MLN.*, xviii., 161-162.—The international edition of Shakespeare, and T. S. Osmond's Study of metre; *MLA.*, xix., 63-64.

Rev. of R. Warwick's edition of The complete works of John Lyly; *AJP.*, xxv., 201-206.

Chaucer and Lollius; *MLA.*, xix., xxii-xxiii.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

A Latin grammar for schools and colleges, pp. xi + 388; Ginn & Co., 1903. [With W. G. Hale.]

A grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, pp. xvii + 352; Ginn & Co., 1904.

A sketch of the linguistic conditions of Chicago, p. 20; *The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, 1903.

CURTIS C. BUSHNELL.

The attitude of Plato toward contemporary Greek thought concerning the future life; *Bulletin of Syracuse University*, Series 4, No. 1 (1903), 3-13.

Verse-translation of "O lux beata"; *Syracuse University Herald*, xxxii., 3 (1903), 75.

Verse-translation of "Quid, tyranne, quid minaris?"; *Ib.*, xxxii., 7 (1904), 215.

*Hymnus ad matutinum dominicae diei* (original Latin poem); *Ib.*, xxxii., 8 (1904), 244.

Latin selections (Martial and Juvenal), with notes, pp. 24; New Haven: J. T. Hathaway, 1904.

EDWARD CAPPS.

The introduction of comedy into the city Dionysia at Athens; a chronological study in Greek literary history; *University of Chicago Decennial Publications*, first series, vol. vi., 261-288 (1903).

The 'Nemesis' of the Younger Cratinus; *HSCP.*, vol. xv. (1904), pp. 61-75.

MITCHELL CARROLL.

Observations on the harbors and walls of ancient Athens; *AJA.*, viii., 88-91 (1904).

Editor: *The George Washington University Bulletin*; published by the University, 1904.

J. E. CHURCH, JR.

Sepultura = sepulcrum; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., lxxiii-lxxiv; *Archiv.*, Bd. xiii., Hft. 3, S. 427-428.

Editor: *Nevada State University Tri-Decennial Celebration, Memorial Volume*, Reno, Nevada, 1904, pp. 204.



EDWARD BULL CLAPP.

Hiatus in Pindar; *PAPA.*, xxxiii., lxxx-lxxxii.

Hiatus in Greek melic poetry; *University of California Publications, Classical Philology*, i., 1-34.

ARTHUR STODDARD COOLEY.

The bronze Hermes from Antikythera; *Records of the Past*, July, 1903.

Greece in 1903; *Boston Evening Transcript*, Oct. 21, 1903.

In old Orchomenos; *ib.*, Jan. 1, 1904.

How the Greeks vote; *Youth's Companion*, Feb. 25, 1904.

The Macedonian tomb and battle-field at Chaironeia; *Records of the Past*, May, 1904.

WALTER DENNISON.

The movements of the chorus chanting the *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace; *University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, i., 49-66.

BENJAMIN L. D'OOGHE.

New Latin grammar, with J. B. Greenough, G. L. Kittredge, and A. A. Howard, being a revision of Allen and Greenough's Latin grammar; Boston: Ginn & Co., 1903, pp. x + 490.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

De Horatii *Serm.*, I. 1; *Revue de Philologie*, xxvii., 233-235.

The supplementary signs of the Greek alphabet; *AJA.*, vii., 429-444.

Observatiunculae ad locos quosdam poetarum romanorum; *Revue de Philologie*, xxvii., 269-272.

Rev. of Newman's edition of the Politics of Aristotle; *Political Science Quarterly*, xix., 157-160.

Notes [Horace, *Carmm.*, I. 3. 1-8; Plato, *Rep.*, 423 B]; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xxii-xxiii.

De Sophoclis *Antigonae* vv. 45 et 46; *Revue de Philologie*, xxviii., 122.

Ad Ciceronis *Catonem Maiorem*; *Revue de Philologie*, xxviii., 123 f.

H. EDMISTON.

The question of the coincidence of word-accent and verse-ictus in the Latin hexameter; *CR.*, xvii., 458-460, and *PAPA.*, xxvii., xxv-xxviii.

Diaeresis after the second foot of the hexameter in Lucretius; *PAPA.*, *ib.*, lx-lxi.

EDGAR ALFRED EMENS.

A Tanagra figurine of Eros; *Syracuse University Bulletin*, iv., No. 1.

HENRY RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH.

Recent archaeological discoveries in Crete; *The University of Toronto Monthly*, December, 1903.

P. Terenti Afri *Andria*, pp. lxxi + 181, second edition; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1904.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Further notes on the *Mostellaria* of Plautus; *AJP.*, xxiv., 245-277.

Lateinisch cena, caesna (*Festus*) „fest”; *Archiv.*, xiii., 436-437.

The word for nightingale in the romance languages; *MLN.*, xviii., 195-196.

Some Greek cognates of the Sanskrit root *twiṣ-*; *CR.*, xviii., 207-208.

Studies of Latin words in *-cinio-*, *-cinia*, I. *Luscinia*; *ib.*, 303-307.

W. S. FERGUSON.

The oligarchic revolution at Athens of the year 103/2 B.C.; *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, iv. (1904), 1-17.

CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY.

Poetry of the people, with a preface on the proper way of introducing the young to the study of poetry; Ginn & Co., 1903, pp. 403.

The principles and progress of English poetry, pp. xc + 600 (Principles by C. M. G.; Progress in collaboration with C. C. Young); New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904.

# PLINY EARLE GODDARD.

Hupa texts; *Univ. Calif. Publ., American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. i., No. 2, pp. 290, 1904.

# EDWIN L. GREEN.

*Idios* as a possessive in Polybius, *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), iv-v.

The optative mood in Diodorus Siculus, *Ib.*, lxii-lxiii.

# ALFRED GUDEMAN.

Rev. of Bornecque's S  n  que le rh  teur, etc.; *AJP.*, xxiv., 337-340.  
Theodor Mommsen; *Latin Leaflet*, Nov. 30 and Dec. 7, 1903.

Rev. of John E. Sandys's History of classical scholarship; *CR.*, xviii., 271-276, 316-321.

# FREDERIC ALDIN HALL.

Homeric stories, pp. 200; American Book Co., 1903.

# KARL P. HARRINGTON.

Studies in the metrical art of the Roman elegists; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), xxviii-xxx.

The letters of Lipsius; *Methodist Review*, lxxvi., 255-263.

# J. E. HARRY.

On the omission of the copula in certain combinations in Greek; *PAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), viii-x.

The meaning of *  μυα τετραπται* in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, 246; *Ib.*, xli-xlii.

The same in full; *CR.*, Dec., 1903.  
Zu Euripides' *Hippolytos*; *Wochenschrift f  r klassische Philologie*, June 22, 1904, pp. 699 f.

# W. A. HEIDEL.

The logic of the pre-Socratic philosophy, in "Studies in logical theory," by John Dewey and others; *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, second series, vol. xi.

Rev. of Carlo Pascal, *Studii critici sul poema di Lucrezio*, *AJP.*, xxiv., 3, 330-335.

Rev. of Hermann Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker griechisch und deutsch*, *Ib.*, 4, 456-465.

# OTTO HELLER.

Die deutsche Schriftstellerin von gestern und heute; *Paedagogische Monatshefte*, iv., 8-9 (Oct., 1903), 251-264.

Vom germanischen Museum; *Mississippi-Blaetter*, Nov., 1903.

Rev. of Dillard, *Deutsche Lyrik*; *MLN.*, Jan., 1904.

Rev. of Kloss, *Lyra Germanica-Latina*; *Mississippi-Blaetter*, 20 March, 1904.

# ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

Adverbial forms in Plautus; *CR.*, xvii., 296-303 (July, 1903).

Carmen Harvardianum, *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, xii., 47-48 (Sept., 1903).

# CHARLES HOEING.

Vica Pota; *AJP.*, xxiv., 323-326.

# MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

Classification of the Barringer find of Alexandrian coins (about 300 in number), in *University of Virginia Alumni Bulletin*, iv., No. 2.

# A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.

Early Persian literature, Rev. of Browne's Literary history of Persia; *Atlantic Monthly*, xci., 275-278.

Bibliographie 'Iranisch'; *IF., Anzeiger*, xiii., 162-174.

- By caravan and cavalcade; *N. Y. Evening Post*, Oct. 3, 1903.  
 Notes from India, second series, illustrated; *JAOS.*, xxiii., 307-317.  
 Benares, the sacred city of the Hindus, its temples, its holy river, and its burning *ghats* of the dead, illustrated; *The Traveller*, i., 22-26.  
 The great Behistun rock and some results of a reëxamination of the old Persian inscriptions on it; *JAOS.*, xxiv., 77-95.  
 Die iranische religion (Schluss); *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, ii., 641-710.  
 Bibliographie 'Iranisch'; *IF., Anzeiger*, xv., 48-57.  
 Contributor and editor of articles on Indo-Iranian subjects in *The New International Encyclopaedia*; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1903.  
 On Sanskrit *l* = Avestan *d*; *JAOS.*, xxv., 175.  
 Notes of a journey to Persia, I, *ib.*, 176-184.
- CHARLES W. L. JOHNSON.  
 Must spelling reform necessarily be phonetic? *ER.*, xxvi., 5 (Dec., 1903), 516-525.
- W. H. JOHNSON.  
 Little Tullia, my darling; *Evening Post*, Saturday Supplement, May 7, 1904.  
 Rev. of Gudeman's sources of Plutarch's Life of Cicero; *Nat.*, lxxvii., 17.  
 Rev. of Lavissee's Education de la démocratie; *ib.*, lxxviii., 75.  
 Rev. of Henderson's Life and principate of Nero; *ib.*, 174.  
 Rev. of Sandys's History of classical scholarship; *ib.*, 394.  
 Rev. of Julian Hawthorne's Hawthorne and his circle; *Dial.*, xxxv., 466.
- GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.  
 Report on *Philologus* lxi. (N. F. Bd. xv.), 1902, in *AJP.*, xxv., 92-96.  
 The use of the floating-ship motive

- in some ancient and renaissance fountains; *AJA.*, viii., 83-84.  
 Review of the Williams Literary Monthly in the *Williams Weekly*, xvii., 290-291.
- ROLAND G. KENT.  
 On Albinovanus Pedito, vv. 1-7, apud Sen. *Suas.* i., 15, in *CR.*, xvii. (1903), 311-312.  
 A history of Thessaly from the earliest historical times to the accession of Philip V of Macedonia; printed in part; doctoral dissertation; New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa., 1904, viii + 27 pp.
- A. L. KROEBER.  
 The languages of the coast of California south of San Francisco; *Univ. Calif. Publ.*, American Archaeology and Ethnology, ii., 31-80. June, 1904.
- EMORY B. LEASE.  
 Livy's use of *-arunt*-, *-erunt*-, and *-ere*; *AJP.*, xxiv., 408-422.  
 Contracted forms of the perfect in Livy; *CR.*, xviii., 27-36.  
 Natal monstrosities in Italy before the age of Augustus; *St. Louis Medical Review*, Sept. 5, 1903.
- HERBERT W. MAGOUN.  
 Is the present theory of Greek elision sound? *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xxiv.-xxv.  
 The dactylic, heroic, and *κατ' ἐνόπιον* forms of the hexameter, and their relation to the elegiac pentameter and the prosodiac tetrameter; *ib.*, li.-lv.  
 Meter or rhythm, which? *SR.*, xii. (1904), 380-381.
- J. IRVING MANATT.  
 Bevan's The house of Seleucus; *AHR.*, ix., i., 126-130.  
 Timotheos and the Persians; *Atlantic Monthly*, xciii., 234-241.  
 The germ of Greek culture; *Brown Alumni Monthly*, April, 1904, 185-188.

## NELSON G. MCCREA.

- The Latin papers of the college entrance examination board; *Latin Leaflet*, March 21 and 28, 1904, also *ER.*, xxviii. (June, 1904), 28-37.  
 Article on Lucretius; *New International Encyclopaedia*, xi., 554-555.

## C. L. MEADER.

- The value of general and comparative linguistics for the classical student; read at the classical conference of the Michigan schoolmasters' club on April 1; *SR.*, xii., 391-398.  
 Notes on the order of words in Latin; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xxxi f.

## TRUMAN MICHELSON.

- On some verb-forms in the Rāmāyana; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xl-xli.  
 Linguistic archaisms of the Rāmāyana, *JAOS.*, xxv. (first half), 89-145.

## C. W. E. MILLER.

- Hephaestion and the anapaest in the Aristophanic trimeter; *TAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), 49-59.

## FRANK G. MOORE.

- M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de senectute (with introduction and notes), pp. 205; text edition, pp. 37; American Book Co., 1904 (Morris and Morgan's series).  
 Studies in Tacitean ellipsis: descriptive passages; *TAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), 5-26.

## LEWIS F. MOTT.

- Articles on Provençal literature, romance languages and troubadours in *The New International Encyclopaedia*; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1903-1904.  
 The position of the soliloquy, "To be or not to be," in Hamlet; *MLA.*, xix., 26-32.

## H. C. NUTTING.

- The modes of conditional thought, *AJP.*, xxiv., 278-303.  
 The Trinummus of Plautus, pp. vi + 80; B. H. Sanborn & Co., Boston, 1903.  
 Some theories on subjunctive protasis with indicative apodosis, *CR.*, xvii., 449-456.

## GEORGE N. OLCOTT.

- Notes on Roman coins; *A. J. Num.*, xxxvii.  
 Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicae, a dictionary of the Latin inscriptions; vol. i., fasc. i. (A-AB), Rome (Loescher), 1904.

## EDWARD T. OWEN.

- Interrogative thought and the means of its expression; *Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, xiv., 355-470.

## SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

- The topography and monuments of ancient Rome, xiv + 514 pp.; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1904.

## HENRY W. PRESCOTT.

- Magister curiae in Plautus's Aulularia, 107; *TAPA.*, xxxiv. (1903), 41-48.

## JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE.

- The vocabulary of Sumerian, *JAOS.*, xxv., 49-67.  
 Le Bouc Émissaire; *Journ. Asiatique*, 1903, 133-156.  
 The Assyro-Babylonian scapegoat controversy; *AJSL.*, xx., 173-181.  
 The code of Hammurabi, *AJT.*, 1904, 601-610.  
 Nisroch and Nusku; *JBL.*, 1904, pt. i.  
 Dying American speech echoes from Connecticut; *Journ. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, 1904, 346-352.  
 Glossary of the Mohegan Pequot language; *Amer. Anthropologist*, vi., 18-45 (with F. G. Speck).

EDWARD K. PUTNAM.

The *Scalacronica* version of *Have-lok*; *TAPA*, xxxiv., xci-xcii.

ROBERT S. RADFORD.

The Latin monosyllables in their relation to accent and quantity; *TAPA*, xxxiv. (1903), 60-103.

On the recession of the Latin accent in connection with monosyllabic words and the traditional word-order, first paper; *AJP*, xxv., 147-162.

Rev. of West's Latin grammar for schools; *CR*, xviii., No. 7 (Oct., 1904).

EDWARD KENNARD RAND.

On the composition of Boethius's *Consolatio philosophiae*; *HSCP*, xv., 1-28.

CARL COSMO RICE.

The etymology of Italian greggio, grizzo; *Modern Philology*, i., No. 2 (October, 1903).

The etymology of the romance words for "to go"; *MLA*, xix., No. 2; new series, xii., 2 (June, 1904).

LEON JOSIAH RICHARDSON.

Rhythm as concerned in poetry; *PAPA*, xxxiv. (1903), lxxxvii-lxxxviii.

The 1904 University of California Summer Session; *Western Journal of Education*, ix., 393-394.

ERNST RIESS.

Studies in superstition: Pindar and Bacchylides; *AJP*, xxiv. (1904), 423-440.

An old worship in Cos; *Latin Leaflet*, iv. (1904), Nos. 76, 77.

Rev. of Minckwitz's Cicero; *Ib*, No. 80.

Miscellae Vergilianae; *Ib*, No. 81.

The new treasures of the Metropolitan Museum; *Ib*, No. 87.

The Ajax of Sophocles (criticism of

the performance in Greek); *Ib*, No. 97.

Miscellanea Superstitiosa; *Ib*, Nos. 98, 99.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

Afterthoughts: on *ab* before proper names beginning with a consonant; on *de tenero ungui*, Hor. *Carm.*, iii. 6. 24; on the meaning of *canicula*; *PAPA*, xxxiv. (1903), lv-lx.

Articles in the New International Encyclopaedia and in the Encyclopaedia Americana.

As editor-in-chief of Allyn & Bacon's College Latin Series; see under PLATNER and WESTCOTT.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

The myth about Tarpeia; *University of Michigan Studies*, i., 1-47.

The lost epitome of Livy; *University of Michigan Studies*, i., 149-260.

Editor: *The University of Michigan Studies*; Humanistic Series, vol. i.

Roman historical sources and institutions; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904.

HUGO K. SCHILLING.

Schenken, translated and abridged from *JGP*, iv., 510-516 ("The semasiology of schenken, 'skink'") by E. E. Meyer; *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung*, iv., 328-330.

Two reminiscences of children's rhymes in Goethe's Faust I.; *MLN*, xix., 153-155.

F. G. G. SCHMIDT.

Sudermann's dramatic development; *PAPA*, xxxiii., ciii-civ (1902).

Wildenbruch's Das edle Blut, with vocabulary; D C. Heath & Co., 1902.

Zur Elisabethen-Legende (Ms. fifteenth century); *JGP*, v., 2, 161-179 (1903).

Christian Gottfried Boeckh's Alt-deutsches Glossarium; *Alemannia*, v. (1904).

August Sperr u. seine Werke; *JGP*, v., 4 (1904).

Scribe's Le Verre d'Eau, edited, W. R. Jenkins; New York, 1904.

Grupp's Kulturgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit; *AHR*, ix., 3, 542-543 (1904).

Dr. W. Kahl's Deutsche Mundartliche Dichtungen; *JGP*, v., 4 (1904).

#### JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.

Vocative in Homer and Hesiod; *AJP*, xxiv., 192 ff.

Vocative in Aeschylus and Sophocles; *Ib.*, xxv., 81 ff.

Homeric notes, first paper; *CR*, xvii., 238 f.; second paper; *Ib.*, xviii., 145 ff.

#### J. HENRY SENDER.

Undine, by Friedrich Baron de la Motte Fouqué, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary; American Book Co.

#### FREDERICK WILLIAM SHIPLEY.

Certain sources of corruption in Latin manuscripts; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904, 100 pp. (Reprinted from *AJA*, vii., Nos. 1, 2, 4.)

#### GRANT SHOWERMAN.

The American college course; *ER*, xxvi., 166-179.

Cicero's appreciation of Greek art; *PAPA*, xxxiv., xxxv-xxxvii.

Rev. of Ernest Gardner's Ancient Athens; *AJP*, xxiv. (1903).

#### E. G. SIHLER.

Autumn leaves; *Satura Senescentis*, in the *Violet* (Year Book of New York University) for 1904.

#### EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT.

Latin *s(s)* from *rs(s)*; *CR*, xviii. (1903), 159.

#### CHARLES WILLIAM SUPER.

Aspects of Roman education; *Journal of Pedagogy*, March, 1904.

Philosophers as failures, *Westminster Review*, June, 1904.

Salt; *Popular Science*, July, 1904.

#### HERBERT CUSHING TOLMAN.

*Mycenaean Troy* (with G. C. Scoggin), vol. v., Vanderbilt Oriental Series, edited by Herbert Cushing Tolman and James Henry Stevenson, 111 pp.; American Book Co., 1904.

Danielsson's Assimilation mit nachträglicher Diaktasis in Homer; *PAPA*, xxxiv., xx.

#### JOHN C. WATSON.

The relation of the scene-headings to the miniatures in manuscripts of Terence; *HSCP*, xiv. (1903), 55-172.

#### RAYMOND WEEKS.

Texts most used in teaching of Old French, *MLA*, vol. xviii., 526-534.

The newly discovered Chancun de Willame (first article), *Modern Philology*, June, 1904, vol. ii., 1-16.

#### CHARLES H. WELLER.

The cave at Vari, description, account of excavation, and history; *AJA*, vii., 263-288.

The pre-Periclean propylon of the Acropolis at Athens; *Ib.*, viii., 35-70.

#### J. H. WESTCOTT.

Livy: books i., xxii., xxiii., with introduction and notes; revised edition, pp. xxxv + 425; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1904.

#### HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

Notice of H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, ii., 1; *AJP*, xxiv. (1903), 362.

Notice of Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfelds sechzigstem Geburtstage, Berlin, 1903; *Ib.*, 485-486.

Notice of A. Carnoy, Le Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions, Louvain, 1902-1903; *Ib.*, xxv. (1904), 114.

The *Codex Canonicianus Lat.*, xli. and the tradition of Juvenal; *PAPA.*, xxxiv., xix.

Bericht über die Jahresversammlung des Archaeological Institute of

America, Dec., 1903; *Deutsche Lit.-Zeitung*, xxv. (1904), Nr. 28, Sp. 1784; *Ib.*, Nr. 29, Sp. 1845-1847.

HENRY B. WRIGHT.

The American college course; *ER.*, xxvii., 384-394.

The campaign of Plataea, pp. 148; New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Co., 1904.

# OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1904-1905.

---

## PRESIDENT.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

## VICE-PRESIDENTS.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.

## SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

FRANK GARDNER MOORE.

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The above-named Officers, and —

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

EDWARD B. CLAPP.

FRANCIS A. MARCH.

MORRIS H. MORGAN.

PAUL SHOREY.



## MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.<sup>1</sup>

1904-1905.

- Prof. F. F. Abbott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1886.  
 William F. Abbott, High School, Worcester, Mass. (38 William St.). 1893.  
 Prof. Charles D. Adams, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1892.  
 Dr. Cyrus Adler, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. (1706 S St.). 1883.  
 Prof. George Henry Allen, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1904.  
 Prof. Hamilton Ford Allen, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1903.  
 Miss Katharine Allen, 228 Langdon St., Madison, Wis. 1899.  
 Prof. Francis G. Allinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (163 George St.). 1893.  
 Principal Harlan P. Amen, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. (Life member). 1897.  
 Prof. Alfred Williams Anthony, Cobb Divinity School, Lewiston, Me. 1890.  
 Prof. W. Muss-Arnolt, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.  
 Dr. R. Arrowsmith, American Book Company, Washington Square, New York, N. Y. 1898.  
 Prof. Sidney G. Ashmore, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y. 1885.  
 William G. Aurelio, Boston University, Boston, Mass. (75 Hancock St.). 1903.  
 Prof. Francis M. Austin, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill. 1902.  
 Prof. C. C. Ayer, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1902.  
 Prof. Frank Cole Babbitt, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (65 Vernon St.). 1897.  
 Herbert L. Baker, 47 Moffat Building, Detroit, Mich. 1889.  
 Prof. William W. Baker, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1902.  
 Dr. Francis K. Ball, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. (Life member). 1894.  
 Dr. Floyd G. Ballentine, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1903.  
 Cecil K. Bancroft, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (213 Durfee Hall). 1898.  
 Prof. Grove E. Barber, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. (1230 L St.). 1902.  
 Miss Amy L. Barbour, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1902.  
 Phillips Barry, 33 Ball Street, Roxbury Crossing, Boston, Mass. 1901.  
 J. Edmund Barss, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1897.

<sup>1</sup> This list has been corrected up to June 15, 1905; permanent addresses are given, as far as may be. Where the residence is left blank, the members in question are in Europe. The Secretary and the Publishers beg to be kept informed of all changes of address.

- George K. Bartholomew, Evanswood, Clifton, Cincinnati, O. 1893.  
 Dr. Samuel E. Bassett, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (168 Sheffield Ave.). 1903.  
 Dr. F. O. Bates, Detroit Central High School, Detroit, Mich. 1900.  
 Prof. William N. Bates, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn. (220 St. Mark's Square). 1894.  
 Prof. William J. Battle, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1893.  
 Prof. Paul V. C. Baur, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (246 Church St.). 1902.  
 John W. Beach, Fort Worth University, Fort Worth, Tex. 1902.  
 Dr. Edward A. Bechtel, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1900.  
 Prof. Isbon T. Beckwith, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1884.  
 Charles H. Beeson, 6020 Ingleside Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 1897.  
 Prof. A. J. Bell, Victoria University, Toronto, Can. (17 Avenue Road). 1887.  
 Prof. Allen R. Benner, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. 1901.  
 Prof. Charles E. Bennett, Cornell University. 1882.  
 Prof. John I. Bennett, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y. 1897.  
 Prof. George R. Berry, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1902.  
 Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1884.  
 William F. Biddle, 4305 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1894.  
 Prof. C. P. Bill, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (853 Logan Ave.). 1894.  
 Rev. Dr. Daniel Moschel Birmingham, Walden University, Nashville, Tenn. (addr.: Park Row Building, New York, N. Y.). 1898.  
 Prof. Charles Edward Bishop, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 1890.  
 Prof. David H. Bishop, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss. 1905.  
 Prof. Robert W. Blake, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. (440 Seneca St.). 1894.  
 Prof. M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1882.  
 Prof. Willis H. Bocock, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1890.  
 Prof. C. W. E. Body, General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. (4 Chelsea Square). 1887.  
 Dr. George M. Bolling, Catholic University of America, 1122 Vermont Ave., Washington, D. C. 1897.  
 Prof. D. Bonbright, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1892.  
 Prof. A. L. Bondurant, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1892.  
 Prof. Campbell Bonner, University of Nashville (Peabody College for Teachers), Nashville, Tenn. (1512½ Demonbreun St.). 1899.  
 Prof. George Willis Botsford, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1894.  
 Prof. Benjamin Parsons Bourland, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1900.  
 Prof. B. L. Bowen, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1895.  
 Prof. Edwin W. Bowen, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1905.  
 Prof. Charles F. Bradley, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1886.  
 Prof. J. Everett Brady, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1891.  
 Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1876.  
 Prof. Walter R. Bridgman, Lake Forest University, Lake Forest, Ill. 1890.

- Prof. James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1887.  
Prof. John A. van Broekhoven, Fairview Avenue, Hyde Park, Cincinnati, O. 1902.  
Miss Caroline G. Brombacher, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (399  
Clermont Ave.). 1897.  
Dr. Carroll N. Brown, Asheville School, Asheville, N. C. 1899.  
Prof. Demarchus C. Brown, Butler College, Irvington, Ind. (125 Downey Ave.,  
Indianapolis, Ind.). 1893.  
Prof. F. W. Brown, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind. 1893.  
Dr. Lester Dorman Brown, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1904.  
Prof. Carleton L. Brownson, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.  
(17 Lexington Ave.). 1892.  
Principal C. F. Brusie, Mount Pleasant Academy, Ossining, N. Y. 1894.  
Prof. Carl D. Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.  
Miss Mary H. Buckingham, Wellesley Hills, Mass. 1897.  
Walter H. Buell, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1887.  
Isaac B. Burgess, Morgan Park Academy, Morgan Park, Ill. 1892.  
Dr. Theodore C. Burgess, Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill. 1900.  
Prof. John M. Burnam, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1899.  
Prof. Sylvester Burnham, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1885.  
Dr. William S. Burrage, Middlebury, Vt. 1898.  
Prof. Harry E. Burton, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1899.  
Prof. Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. 1878.  
Prof. Curtis C. Bushnell, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. (201 Dell St.). 1900.  
Pres. Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. 1869.  
Miss Miriam A. Bytel, Gilman School, Cambridge, Mass. (10 Avon St.). 1901.  
Prof. Edward Capps, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1889.  
Prof. Mitchell Carroll, Columbian University, Washington, D. C. 1894.  
Frank Carter, The College, Winchester, England. 1897.  
Dr. Franklin Carter, 324 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. 1871.  
Prof. Jesse Benedict Carter, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy  
(Via Vicenza 5). 1898.  
Prof. Mary Emily Case, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1895.  
Prof. Clarence F. Castle, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1888.  
William Van Allen Catron, West Side High School, Milwaukee, Wis. (1306 Grand  
Ave.). 1896.  
Prof. Julia H. Caverno, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1902.  
Miss Eva Channing, Exeter Chambers, Boston, Mass. 1883.  
Prof. A. C. Chapin, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1888.  
Prof. Henry Leland Chapman, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1892.  
Prof. George Davis Chase, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1900.  
Dr. George H. Chase, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (24 Grays Hall).  
1899.  
Prof. S. R. Cheek, Centre College of Kentucky, Danville, Ky. 1890.  
Miss Emma Kirkland Clark, 545 A Quincy St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1896.  
Dr. Frank Lowry Clark, Washburn College, Topeka, Kan. (1511 West St.). 1902.  
Prof. Charles Nelson Cole, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. 1902.  
Prof. George Stuart Collins, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1897.  
Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1887.

- William T. Colville, Carbondale, Pa. 1884.  
 Principal D. Y. Comstock, St. Johnsbury, Vt. 1888.  
 Prof. Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del. 1897.  
 Edmund C. Cook, Berkeley School, 72d St. and West End Ave., New York, N. Y. 1904.  
 Dr. Arthur Stoddard Cooley, 387 Central St., Auburndale, Mass. 1896.  
 J. Randolph Coolidge, Jr., Chestnut Hill, Mass. 1884.  
 Prof. William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1888.  
 Prof. W. H. Crogman, Clark University, South Atlanta, Ga. 1898.  
 W. L. Cushing, Westminster School, Simsbury, Conn. 1888.  
 Prof. William K. Denison, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass. 1899.  
 Prof. Walter Dennison, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1899.  
 Prof. Samuel C. Derby, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1895.  
 Sherwood Owen Dickerman. 1902.  
 Prof. Howard Freeman Doane, 252 West 104th St., New York, N. Y. 1897.  
 Prof. Benjamin L. D'Ooge, State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. 1895.  
 Prof. Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1873.  
 Prof. Louis H. Dow, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1895.  
 Prof. Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1897.  
 Prof. Eli Dunkle, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1904.  
 Prof. Frederic Stanley Dunn, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1899.  
 Miss Emily Helen Dutton, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1898.  
 Prof. Mortimer Lamson Earle, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1890.  
 Dr. Herman L. Ebeling, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1892.  
 Prof. William S. Ebersole, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1893.  
 Prof. W. A. Eckels, Miami University, Oxford, O. 1894.  
 Dr. Homer J. Edmiston, Via Vicenza 5, Rome, Italy. 1894.  
 Prof. George V. Edwards, State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. (121 Normal St.). 1901.  
 Prof. Katharine M. Edwards, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1893.  
 Prof. James C. Egbert, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1889.  
 Prof. Wallace Stedman Elden, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (1462 Neil Ave.). 1900.  
 Prof. A. Marshall Elliott, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.  
 Prof. W. A. Elliott, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1897.  
 Prof. Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1887.  
 Prof. L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1883.  
 Miss E. Antoinette Ely, The Clifton School, Cincinnati, O. 1893.  
 Prof. Edgar A. Emens, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 1895.  
 Prof. O. F. Emerson, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (50 Wilbur St.). 1903.  
 Prof. Annie Crosby Emery, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1896.  
 Prof. George Taylor Ettinger, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 1896.  
 Principal O. Faduma, Peabody Academy, Troy, N. C. 1900.  
 Prof. Arthur Fairbanks, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1886.  
 Prof. Charles E. Fay, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass. 1885.  
 Prof. Edwin W. Fay, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1889.  
 Pres. Thomas Fell, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. 1888.

- Principal F. J. Fessenden, Fessenden School, West Newton, Mass. 1890.  
Prof. Mervin G. Filler, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1905.  
Dr. George Converse Fiske, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (609 Lake St.). 1900.  
Prof. Edward Fitch, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1890.  
Prof. Thomas Fitz-Hugh, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. (Life member). 1902.  
Prof. Roy C. Flickinger, Epworth University, Oklahoma City, Okl. 1905.  
Miss Helen C. Flint, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1897.  
Prof. Herbert B. Foster, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 1900.  
Prof. Frank H. Fowler, Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill. 1893.  
Prof. Harold N. Fowler, Western Reserve University (College for Women), Cleveland, O. 1885.  
Miss Susan Fowler, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1904.  
Dr. Wilmer Cave France, Radnor, Pa. 1900.  
Dr. Susan B. Franklin, Ethical Culture School, 63d St. and Central Park West, New York, N. Y. 1890.  
Dr. I. F. Frisbee, 187 W. Canton St., Boston, Mass. 1898.  
Prof. Charles Kelsey Gaines, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. 1890.  
Dr. William Gallagher, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass. 1886.  
Frank A. Gallup, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. (320 Clinton Ave.). 1898.  
Prof. Henry Gibbons, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (405 South 41st St.). 1890.  
Principal Seth K. Gifford, Moses Brown School, Providence, R. I. 1891.  
Prof. John W. Gilbert, Paine College, Augusta, Ga. (1620 Magnolia St.). 1897.  
Prof. Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1876.  
Clarence Willard Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Roxbury, Mass. (6 Copeland St.). 1901.  
Prof. Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (35 Edgehill Road). 1883.  
Prof. Charles J. Goodwin, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. 1891.  
Prof. William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (5 Follen St.). 1870.  
Prof. Roscoe Allan Grant, De Witt Clinton High School, New York, N. Y. (60 West 13th St.). 1902.  
Prof. E. L. Green, South Carolina College, Columbia, S. C. 1898.  
Prof. Herbert Eveleth Greene, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1890.  
Prof. John Greene, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1902.  
Prof. Wilber J. Greer, Washburn College, Topeka, Kan. 1892.  
Dr. Alfred Gudeman, Franz Josefstrasse 12, Munich, Germany. 1889.  
Dr. Roscoe Guernsey, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.  
Prof. Charles Burton Gulick, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (18 Walker St.). 1894.  
Prof. George D. Hadzsits, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1904.  
Dr. Walter D. D. Hadzsits, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1904.  
Miss Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1902.  
Prof. William Gardner Hale, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1882.

- Prof. Arthur P. Hall, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1886.  
 Prof. F. A. Hall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (531 Spring Ave.). 1896.  
 Frank T. Hallett, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (283 George St.). 1902.  
 Prof. T. F. Hamblin, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1895.  
 Prof. Adelbert Hamilton, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. 1895.  
 Miss Clemence Hamilton, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1901.  
 Principal John Calvin Hanna, High School, Oak Park, Ill. (209 South East Ave.). 1896.  
 Prof. Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1869.  
 Prof. Albert Granger Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1896.  
 Pres. William R. Harper, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.  
 Prof. Karl P. Harrington, University of Maine, Orono, Me. 1892.  
 Miss Mary B. Harris, 2252 Calumet Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1902.  
 Prof. W. A. Harris, Richmond College, Richmond, Va. (1606 West Grace St.). 1895.  
 Prof. William Fenwick Harris, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (8 Mercer Circle). 1901.  
 Prof. J. E. Harry, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1896.  
 Dr. Carl A. Harström, The Folly, Norwalk, Conn. 1900.  
 Prof. Samuel Hart, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. 1871.  
 Eugene W. Harter, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (121 Marlborough Road). 1901.  
 Prof. Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.  
 Prof. Adeline Belle Hawes, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1902.  
 Dr. Edward Southworth Hawes, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1888.  
 Rev. Dr. Henry H. Haynes, 6 Ellery St., Cambridge, Mass. 1900.  
 Prof. F. M. Hazen, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1896.  
 Dr. Theodore Woolsey Heermance, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1897.  
 Prof. W. A. Heidel, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. 1900.  
 Prof. F. B. R. Hellems, State University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1900.  
 Prof. Otto Heller, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1896.  
 Nathan Wilbur Helm, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1900.  
 Prof. George Hempl, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1027 East University Ave.). 1895.  
 Prof. Archer Willmot Hendrick, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 1904.  
 Prof. G. L. Hendrickson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.  
 Adam Fremont Hendrix, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1904.  
 Prof. John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1886.  
 Edwin H. Higley, Groton School, Groton, Mass. 1899.  
 Prof. Henry T. Hildreth, Roanoke College, Salem, Va. 1896.  
 Prof. James M. Hill, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1900.  
 Dr. Gertrude Hirst, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.  
 Harwood Hoadley, 140 West 13th St., New York, N. Y. 1903.  
 Archibald L. Hodges, Wadleigh High School, 114th St., near 7th Ave., New York City. 1899.  
 Prof. Arthur W. Hodgman, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (202 West 8th Ave.). 1896.

- Dr. Charles Hoeing, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. 1899.  
Prof. Horace A. Hoffman, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind. 1893.  
Dr. D. H. Holmes, Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (878 Driggs Ave.). 1900.  
Prof. W. D. Hooper, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1894.  
Prof. E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (299 Lawrence St.). 1883.  
Prof. Herbert Müller Hopkins, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (4 Trinity St.). 1898.  
Prof. Joseph Clark Hoppin, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1900.  
Prof. William A. Houghton, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1892.  
Prof. Albert A. Howard, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (12 Walker St.). 1892.  
Prof. George E. Howes, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt. 1896.  
Prof. Frank G. Hubbard, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.  
Prof. J. H. Huddilston, University of Maine, Orono, Me. 1898.  
Prof. Walter Hulihen, Grant University, Chattanooga, Tenn. 1904.  
Prof. Milton W. Humphreys, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1871.  
Stephen A. Hurlbut, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1903.  
Dr. George B. Hussey, East Orange, N. J. 1887.  
Frederick L. Hutson, 5727 Monroe Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1902.  
Prof. J. W. D. Ingersoll, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (311 Crown St.). 1897.  
Andrew Ingraham, 4 Bryant St., Cambridge, Mass. 1888.  
Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1884.  
Prof. George E. Jackson, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (4400 Morgan St.). 1890.  
Prof. M. W. Jacobus, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. (14 Marshall St.). 1893.  
Prof. Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (113 Walker St.). 1882.  
Dr. Samuel A. Jeffers, State Normal School, California, Pa. 1904.  
Miss Anna S. Jenkins, 427 Nostrand Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1899.  
Dr. Charles W. L. Johnson, 32 East Preston St., Baltimore, Md. 1897.  
Prof. William H. Johnson, Denison University, Granville, O. 1895.  
Prof. Eva Johnston, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.  
Dr. George W. Johnston, University of Toronto, Toronto, Can. 1895.  
Augustine Jones, Providence, R. I. 1896.  
Prof. J. C. Jones, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.  
Prof. George Dwight Kellogg, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1897.  
Prof. Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1890.  
Dr. Roland G. Kent, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (3707 Woodland Ave.). 1903.  
Prof. Charles R. Keyes, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1901.  
Prof. John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1889.  
Prof. William Hamilton Kirk, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1898.  
Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1887.

- Prof. J. C. Kirtland, Jr., Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1895.  
 Prof. George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Hilliard St.). 1884.  
 Dr. William H. Klapp, Academy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1324 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1894.  
 Prof. Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (1773 Sedgwick Ave.). 1892.  
 Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H. 1889.  
 Prof. A. G. Laird, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1890.  
 Prof. William A. Lamberton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.  
 Prof. W. B. Langsdorf, 189 Kokutaijimura, Hiroshima, Japan. 1895.  
 Prof. Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Farrar St.). 1877.  
 Lewis H. Lapham, 8 Bridge St., New York, N. Y. 1880.  
 Prof. William Cranston Lawton, Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y. (224 Willoughby Ave.). 1888.  
 Prof. Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1888.  
 Dr. Arthur G. Leacock, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1899.  
 Dr. Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (1603 Amsterdam Ave.). 1895.  
 Dr. J. T. Lees, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. 1888.  
 Prof. Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1880.  
 Prof. Charles Edgar Little, University of Nashville, Nashville, Tenn. 1902.  
 Miss Dale Livingstone, State Normal School, California, Pa. 1902.  
 Prof. Gonzalez Lodge, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1888.  
 Prof. O. F. Long, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1900.  
 Prof. George D. Lord, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1887.  
 D. O. S. Lowell, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass. 1894.  
 Prof. Frederick Lutz, Albion College, Albion, Mich. 1883.  
 Prof. Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1890.  
 Prof. Walton Brooks McDaniel, College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1901.  
 Prof. J. H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1871.  
 Prof. A. St. Clair Mackenzie, State College of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. 1901.  
 Prof. George F. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O. 1885.  
 Miss Harriet E. McKinstry, Lake Erie College, Painesville, O. 1881.  
 Prof. H. Z. McLain, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1884.  
 Pres. George E. MacLean, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. (603 College St.). 1891.  
 Prof. W. J. McMurtry, Yankton College, Yankton, S. D. 1893.  
 Prof. Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1894.  
 David Magie, Jr., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (33 Prospect Ave.). 1901.  
 Prof. H. W. Magoun, 70 Kirkland St., Cambridge, Mass. 1891.  
 Prof. J. H. T. Main, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. 1891.  
 Prof. J. Irving Manatt, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (15 Keene St.). 1875.  
 Prof. John M. Manly, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1896.



- Prof. W. G. Manly, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.  
Prof. F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1869.  
Prof. Allan Marquand, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.  
Prof. Winfred R. Martin, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1879.  
Miss Ellen F. Mason, 1 Walnut St., Boston, Mass. 1885.  
Dr. Maurice W. Mather, 13 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge, Mass. 1894.  
Dr. Clarence Linton Meader, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1902.  
Prof. John Moffatt Mecklin, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1900.  
Prof. Frank Ivan Merchant, 65 Irving Place, New York City. 1898.  
Ernest Loren Meritt, 435 Elm St., New Haven, Conn. 1903.  
Prof. Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1883.  
Dr. Truman Michelson, 69 Walker St., Cambridge, Mass. 1900.  
Dr. Alfred W. Milden, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va. 1903.  
Prof. C. W. E. Miller, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1892.  
Prof. Walter Miller, Tulane University, New Orleans, La. 1900.  
Prof. Clara Millerd, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. 1902.  
Dr. Richard A. v. Minckwitz, De Witt Clinton High School, Manhattan, New York, N. Y. (Amsterdam Ave. and 102d St.). 1895.  
Charles A. Mitchell, Asheville School, Asheville, N. C. 1893.  
Prof. Clifford Herschel Moore, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy (Via Vicenza 5). 1889.  
Prof. Frank G. Moore, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1888.  
Prof. George F. Moore, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (3 Divinity Ave.). 1885.  
Prof. J. Leverett Moore, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1887.  
Prof. Lewis B. Moore, Howard University, Washington, D. C. 1896.  
Paul E. More, 265 Springdale Ave., East Orange, N. J. 1896.  
Prof. James H. Morgan, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1897.  
Prof. Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (45 Garden St.). 1887.  
Prof. Edward P. Morris, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (53 Edgehill Road). 1886.  
Prof. Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (17 Lexington Ave.). 1898.  
Prof. George F. Mull, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1896.  
Prof. Wilfred P. Mustard, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1892.  
Prof. Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1872.  
Dr. K. P. R. Neville, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill. (1002 Oregon St., Urbana, Ill.). 1902.  
Dr. Charles B. Newcomer, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1900.  
Prof. Barker Newhall, Kenyon College, Gambier, O. 1891.  
Emily Norcross Newton (Mrs. James H.), Holyoke, Mass. (159 Chestnut St.). 1902.  
Prof. Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1888.  
Dr. William A. Nitze, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.  
Prof. Richard Norton, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy (Via Vicenza 5). 1897.

- Prof. George N. Olcott, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (438 W. 116th St.). 1899.
- Prof. Edward T. Owen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.
- Prof. W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1875.
- Prof. William A. Packard, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1872.
- Miss Elisabeth H. Palmer, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1902.
- Prof. Charles P. Parker, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (1075 Massachusetts Ave.). 1884.
- Prof. James M. Paton, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1887.
- John Patterson, Louisville High School, Louisville, Ky. (1117 Fourth St.). 1900.
- Dr. Charles Peabody, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. (197 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Mass.). 1894.
- Prof. E. M. Pease, 1423 Chapin Street, Washington, D. C. 1887.
- Prof. Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1871.
- Miss Frances Pellett, Kelly Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1893.
- Dr. Daniel A. Penick, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1902.
- Prof. Charles W. Peppeler, Emory College, Oxford, Ga. 1899.
- Dr. Elizabeth Mary Perkins, 1355 Kenesaw St., Washington, D. C. 1904.
- Prof. Emma M. Perkins, Western Reserve University (College for Women), Cleveland, O. 1892.
- Prof. Bernadotte Perrin, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (136 Farnam Hall). 1879.
- Prof. Edward D. Perry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (542 West 114th St.). 1882.
- Prof. John Pickard, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1893.
- Dr. William Taggard Piper, 179 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1885.
- Prof. Samuel Ball Platner, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (24 Cornell St.). 1885.
- Prof. William Porter, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 1888.
- Prof. Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1886.
- Prof. Franklin H. Potter, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1898.
- Henry Preble, 42 Stuyvesant Place, New Brighton, Staten Island, N. Y. 1882.
- Prof. William K. Prentice, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (12 Nassau St.). 1895.
- Prof. Ferris W. Price, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 1895.
- Prof. Benjamin F. Prince, Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. 1893.
- Prof. John Dyneley Prince, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1899.
- Prof. Robert S. Radford, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. (710 Park Place). 1900.
- M. M. Ramsey, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1894.
- Dr. Edward Kennard Rand, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (104 Lake View Ave.). 1902.
- Prof. John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky. 1885.
- Prof. A. G. Rembert, Woford College, Spartansburg, S. C. 1902.
- Prof. Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (221 Church St.). 1884.
- Dr. Rufus B. Richardson, *The Independent*, 130 Fulton St., New York, N. Y. 1882.

- Dr. Ernst Riess, De Witt Clinton High School, Manhattan, N. Y. (Amsterdam Ave. and 102d St.). 1895.
- Prof. Edmund Y. Robbins, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.
- Dr. Arthur W. Roberts, Brookline High School, Brookline, Mass. 1884.
- Prof. David M. Robinson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1905.
- Dr. James J. Robinson, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1902.
- Prof. W. A. Robinson, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J. 1888.
- Prof. Joseph C. Rockwell, Buchtel College, Akron, O. 1896.
- Prof. F. E. Rockwood, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1885.
- Prof. Cornelia H. B. Rogers, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1903.
- George B. Rogers, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1902.
- Prof. John C. Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (4400 Chestnut St.). 1890.
- C. A. Rosegrant, Potsdam State Normal School, Potsdam, N. Y. 1902.
- Prof. Clarence F. Ross, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1902.
- Prof. August Rupp, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1902.
- Dr. Arthur W. Ryder, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (72 Perkins Hall). 1902.
- Dr. Julius Sachs, Classical School for Girls, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y. 1875.
- Benjamin H. Sanborn, Wellesley, Mass. 1890.
- Prof. Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (213 South Thayer St.). 1899.
- Prof. Myron R. Sanford, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1894.
- Miss Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1900.
- Joseph H. Sawyer, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass. 1897.
- Prof. W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O. 1882.
- Prof. J. J. Schlicher, State Normal School, Terre Haute, Ind. 1901.
- Prof. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1894.
- Edmund F. Schreiner, 486 N. Clark St., Chicago, Ill. 1900.
- G. E. Scoggin, Cambridge, Mass. 1904.
- Dr. Charles P. G. Scott, Yonkers, N. Y. (150 Woodworth Ave.). 1880.
- Prof. John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (2030 Orrington Ave.). 1898.
- Miss Annie N. Scribner, 1823 Orrington Ave., Evanston, Ill. 1900.
- Prof. Henry S. Scribner, Western University of Pennsylvania, Allegheny City, Pa. 1889.
- Dr. Helen M. Searles, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1893.
- Charles D. Seely, State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y. 1888.
- Prof. William J. Seelye, Wooster University, Wooster, O. 1888.
- J. B. Sewall, Brandon Hall, Brookline, Mass. 1871.
- Prof. T. D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (34 Hillhouse Ave.). 1873.
- Prof. Charles H. Shannon, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. 1900.
- Prof. R. H. Sharp, Jr., Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va. (College Park P.O.). 1897.
- Prof. J. A. Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass. 1876.
- Pres. Andrew Shedd, University of Florida, Lake City, Fla. 1904.

- Prof. Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (11 Francis Ave.). 1881.
- Prof. F. W. Shipley, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1900.
- Prof. Paul Shorey, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
- Prof. Grant Showerman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1900.
- Dr. Edgar S. Shumway, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1885.
- Prof. E. G. Sihler, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1876.
- Prof. Charles F. Sitterly, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. 1902.
- Prof. M. S. Slaughter, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1887.
- Principal M. C. Smart, Littleton, N. H. 1900.
- Prof. Charles Forster Smith, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1883.
- Prof. Charles S. Smith, Columbian University, Washington, D. C. (2122 H St.). 1895.
- Prof. Clement L. Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1882.
- Prof. Harry de Forest Smith, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1899.
- Prof. Josiah R. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (257 E. Broad St.). 1885.
- Prof. Kirby F. Smith, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1897.
- Prof. Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (91 Walker St.). 1886.
- Dr. George C. S. Southworth, Gambier, O. 1883.
- Prof. Edward H. Spieker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (915 Edmondson Ave.). 1884.
- Dr. Sidney G. Stacey, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (119 Montague St.). 1901.
- Prof. Jonathan Y. Stanton, Bates College, Lewiston, Me. 1888.
- Eric Arthur Starbuck, Worcester, Mass. 1904.
- Miss Josephine Stary, 31 West Sixty-first St., New York, N. Y. 1899.
- Prof. R. B. Steele, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (2401 West End). 1893.
- Prof. J. R. S. Sterrett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (2 South Ave.). 1885.
- Prof. F. H. Stoddard, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1890.
- Dr. Duane Reed Stuart, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1901.
- Dr. E. H. Sturtevant, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1901.
- Dr. Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1881.
- Prof. William F. Swahlen, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1904.
- Dr. Marguerite Sweet, 13 Ten Bronck St., Albany, N. Y. 1892.
- Prof. Frank B. Tarbell, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1882.
- Prof. Joseph R. Taylor, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1902.
- Prof. Julian D. Taylor, Colby University, Waterville, Me. 1890.
- Prof. Glanville Terrell, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky. 1898.
- Prof. William E. Thompson, Hamline University, Hamline, Minn. 1877.
- Dr. Charles H. Thurber, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1901.
- Prof. Fitz Gerald Tisdall, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (17 Lexington Ave.). 1889.
- Prof. Henry A. Todd, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1887.
- Prof. H. C. Tolman, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1889.

- Prof. Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y. 1885.  
Dr. O. S. Tonks, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1903.  
Prof. J. A. Tufts, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1898.  
Prof. Milton H. Turk, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1896.  
Prof. Esther Van Deman, The Woman's College, Baltimore, Md. 1899.  
Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (121 High St.). 1869.  
Prof. N. P. Vlachos, Temple College, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.  
Prof. Frank Vogel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass. 1904.  
Dr. W. H. Wait, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1893.  
Dr. John W. H. Walden, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1889.  
Prof. Arthur T. Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1895.  
Dr. Alice Walton, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1894.  
Dr. Edwin G. Warner, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1897.  
Andrew McCorrie Warren, care of Brown, Shipley & Co., Founders' Court, London. 1892.  
Dr. Arletta Warren, State Normal School, Madison, S. D. 1904.  
Prof. Minton Warren, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (105 Irving St.). 1874.  
Prof. William E. Waters, New York University, University Heights, N. Y. (604 West 115th St.). 1885.  
Dr. John C. Watson, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1902.  
Dr. Helen L. Webster, Wilkesbarre Institute, Wilkesbarre, Pa. 1890.  
Prof. Raymond Weeks, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.  
Dr. Charles Heald Weller, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (392 Orange St.). 1903.  
Dr. Mary C. Welles, Newington, Conn. 1898.  
Prof. Andrew F. West, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1886.  
Prof. J. H. Westcott, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.  
Prof. J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Stanfordville, N. Y. 1869.  
Prof. L. B. Wharton, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 1888.  
Prof. Arthur L. Wheeler, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1899.  
Prof. James R. Wheeler, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1885.  
Prof. G. M. Whicher, Normal College, New York, N. Y. 1891.  
Dr. Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (424 Dryden Road). 1886.  
Prof. John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (18 Concord Ave.). 1874.  
Vice-Chancellor B. Lawton Wiggins, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn. 1892.  
Prof. Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1884.  
Prof. Henry D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1898.  
Charles R. Williams, Indianapolis, Ind. (1005 N. Meridian St.). 1887.  
Prof. George A. Williams, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich. (136 Thompson St.). 1891.  
Prof. Mary G. Williams, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1899.  
Prof. Harry Langford Wilson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1898.  
Miss Julia E. Winslow, 31 Sidney Place, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1903.  
Dr. J. D. Wolcott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1898.

Prof. E. L. Wood, Manual Training High School, Providence, R. I. (271 Alabama Ave.). 1888.

Prof. Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.

Dr. Willis Patten Woodman, 6 Greenough Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass. 1901.

Prof. Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1887.

C. C. Wright, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1902.

Prof. Ellsworth D. Wright, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis. 1898.

Dr. Henry B. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (136 Farnam Hall). 1903.

Prof. Henry P. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (128 York St.). 1883.

Prof. John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (38 Quincy St.). 1874.

Prof. Clarence H. Young, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (312 West 88th St.). 1890.

Prof. R. B. Youngman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1901.

[Number of Members, 505.]

WESTERN BRANCH.

MEMBERS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF  
THE PACIFIC COAST.

(ESTABLISHED 1899.)

Membership in the American Philological Association prior to the organization of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast is indicated by a date earlier than 1900.

- Albert H. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
Prof. James T. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2243 College Ave.). 1898.  
Prof. Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 1887.  
Prof. M. B. Anderson, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.  
Prof. H. T. Archibald, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal. 1901.  
Prof. William D. Arnes, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.  
Prof. William F. Badè, Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
Dr. J. W. Basore, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.  
Prof. C. B. Bradley, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2639 Durant Ave.). 1900.  
Carlos Bransby, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
Rev. William A. Brewer, San Mateo, Cal. 1900.  
Elvyn F. Burrill, 2536 Bancroft Way, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
Prof. Luella Clay Carson, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1900.  
B. H. Cerf, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
Samuel Chambers, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
Prof. J. E. Church, Jr., State University of Nevada, Reno, Nev. 1901.  
Prof. Edward B. Clapp, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1 Bushnell Place). 1886.  
A. Horatio Cogswell, 2135 Santa Clara Ave., Alameda, Cal. 1900.  
Prof. W. A. Cooper, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.  
Prof. L. W. Cushman, Nevada State University, Reno, Nev. 1900.  
J. Allen De Cou, Red Bluff, Cal. 1900.  
L. J. Demeter, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
Monroe E. Deutsch, San Francisco, Cal. 1904.  
Henry B. Dewing, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
Prof. J. Elmore, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.  
Prof. Alfred Emerson, Affiliated Colleges, San Francisco, Cal. 1903.  
Prof. H. Rushton Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.  
Dr. W. S. Ferguson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1899.  
Prof. Ewald Flügel, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.  
Dr. B. O. Foster, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1899.  
Prof. P. J. Frein, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1900.  
Prof. John Fryer, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.

- Dr. John Gamble, Haywards, Cal. 1902.  
 Prof. Charles Mills Gayley, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1895.  
 Charles Bertie Gleason, High School, San Jose, Cal. 1900.  
 Mr. Pliny E. Goddard, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.  
 Prof. Julius Goebel, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.  
 Walter H. Graves, 1428 Seventh Ave., Oakland, Cal. 1900.  
 Miss Rebecca T. Greene, Palo Alto, Cal. 1900.  
 Prof. James O. Griffin, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1896.  
 Prof. A. S. Haggett, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1901.  
 Walter M. Hart, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
 Miss Hodgkinson, Lowell High School, San Francisco, Cal. 1903.  
 M. C. James, High School, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
 Prof. Oliver M. Johnston, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.  
 W. L. Keep, Red Bluff, Cal. 1900.  
 Tracy R. Kelley, 2214 Jones St., San Francisco, Cal. 1900.  
 Dr. A. L. Kroeber, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1902.  
 Prof. A. F. Lange, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
 Ivan M. Linforth, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
 Prof. Max L. Margolis, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
 E. W. Martin, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1903.  
 Prof. John E. Matzke, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.  
 Prof. William A. Merrill, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1886.  
 Francis O. Mower, Napa High School, Napa, Cal. 1900.  
 Edward J. Murphy, Cabias, Nueva Ecija, Philippine Islands. 1900.  
 Prof. Augustus T. Murray, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.  
 Prof. A. G. Newcomer, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal. 1902.  
 Rabbi Jacob Nieto, 1719 Bush St., San Francisco, Cal. 1900.  
 Prof. George R. Noyes, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1901.  
 Prof. H. C. Nutting, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (P. O. Box 272). 1900.  
 Dr. Charles J. O'Connor, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
 Dr. Andrew Oliver, San Mateo, Cal. 1900.  
 Prof. F. M. Padelford, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1901.  
 Clarence Paschall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
 Prof. Henry W. Prescott, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1899.  
 Prof. Clifton Price, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1899.  
 E. K. Putnam, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.  
 Prof. A. Putzker, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
 Miss Cecilia L. Raymond, 2407 S. Atherton St., Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
 Prof. Karl G. Rendtorff, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1900.  
 Prof. C. C. Rice, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1902.  
 Prof. Leon J. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1895.  
 Prof. H. W. Rolfe, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.



- Prof. H. K. Schilling, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1901.  
Prof. F. G. G. Schmidt, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1900.  
C. F. Schmutzler, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1904.  
Prof. Colbert Searles, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.  
1901.  
Prof. Henry Senger, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1900.  
S. S. Seward, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1902.  
Prof. David Thomson, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1902.  
Rabbi Jacob Voorsanger, 1249 Franklin St., San Francisco, Cal. 1901.  
Prof. C. W. Wells, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1903.  
President Benjamin I. Wheeler, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1879.

[Number of Members, 84. Total, 505 + 84 = 589 ]

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWNS)  
SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

- Albany, N. Y.: New York State Library.  
 Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College Library.  
 Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University Library.  
 Auburn, N. Y.: Theological Seminary.  
 Austin, Texas: University of Texas Library.  
 Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Library.  
 Baltimore, Md.: Peabody Institute.  
 Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Library.  
 Boston, Mass.: Boston Public Library.  
 Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Brooklyn Library.  
 Brunswick, Me.: Bowdoin College Library.  
 Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College Library.  
 Buffalo, N. Y.: The Buffalo Library.  
 Burlington, Vt.: Library of the University of Vermont.  
 Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library.  
 Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Library.  
 Chicago, Ill.: The Newberry Library.  
 Chicago, Ill.: Public Library.  
 Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Library.  
 Clermont Ferrand, France: Bibliothèque Universitaire.  
 Cleveland, O.: Library of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.  
 College Hill, Mass.: Tufts College Library.  
 Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Library.  
 Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College Library.  
 Detroit, Mich.: Public Library.  
 Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Library.  
 Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Library.  
 Gambier, O.: Kenyon College Library.  
 Greencastle, Ind.: Library of De Pauw University.  
 Hanover, N. H.: Dartmouth College Library.  
 Iowa City, Ia.: Library of State University.  
 Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Library.  
 Lincoln, Neb.: Library of State University of Nebraska.  
 Marietta, O.: Marietta College Library.  
 Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Library.  
 Milwaukee, Wis.: Public Library.  
 Minneapolis, Minn.: Athenæum Library.  
 Minneapolis, Minn.: Library of the University of Minnesota.  
 Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Library.  
 Newton Centre, Mass.: Library of Newton Theological Institution.  
 New York, N. Y.: Astor Library.  
 New York, N. Y.: Library of Columbia University.  
 New York, N. Y.: Library of the College of the City of New York (Lexington Ave. and Twenty-third St.).  
 New York, N. Y.: Union Theological Seminary Library (700 Park Ave.).

Olivet, Mich. : Olivet College Library.  
Philadelphia, Pa. : The Library Company of Philadelphia.  
Philadelphia, Pa. : The Mercantile Library.  
Philadelphia, Pa. : University of Pennsylvania Library.  
Pittsburg, Pa. : Carnegie Library.  
Poughkeepsie, N. Y. : Vassar College Library.  
Providence, R. I. : Brown University Library.  
Rochester, N. Y. : Rochester University Library.  
Tokio, Japan : Library of Imperial University.  
Toronto, Can. : University of Toronto Library.  
University of Virginia, Va. : University Library.  
Vermilion, South Dakota : Library of University of South Dakota.  
Washington, D. C. : Library of the Catholic University of America.  
Washington, D. C. : United States Bureau of Education.  
Wellesley, Mass. : Wellesley College Library.  
Worcester, Mass. : Free Public Library.

[Number of subscribing institutions, 60.]

---

TO THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS THE TRANSACTIONS ARE  
ANNUALLY SENT, GRATIS.

American School of Classical Studies, Athens.  
American School of Classical Studies, Rome (Via Vicenza 5).  
British Museum, London.  
Royal Asiatic Society, London.  
Philological Society, London.  
Society of Biblical Archæology, London.  
Indian Office Library, London.  
Bodleian Library, Oxford.  
University Library, Cambridge, England.  
Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.  
Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.  
Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.  
Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.  
North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.  
Japan Asiatic Society, Yokohama.  
Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia.  
Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.  
Reykjavik College Library, Iceland.  
University of Christiania, Norway.  
University of Upsala, Sweden.  
Stadsbiblioteket, Göteborg, Sweden.  
Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.  
Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.  
Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.  
Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.

Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.  
 Société Asiatique, Paris, France.  
 Athénée Oriental, Louvain, Belgium.  
 Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.  
 Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.  
 Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany.  
 Royal Saxon Academy of Sciences, Leipsic.  
 Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.  
 Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.  
 Library of the University of Bonn.  
 Library of the University of Freiburg in Baden.  
 Library of the University of Giessen.  
 Library of the University of Jena.  
 Library of the University of Königsberg.  
 Library of the University of Leipsic.  
 Library of the University of Toulouse.  
 Library of the University of Tübingen.  
 Imperial Ottoman Museum, Constantinople.  
 Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

[Number of foreign institutions, 43.]

---

TO THE FOLLOWING FOREIGN JOURNALS THE TRANSACTIONS ARE ANNUALLY  
SENT, GRATIS.

Athenæum, London.  
 Classical Review, London.  
 Revue Critique, Paris.  
 Revue de Philologie (Adrien Krebs, 11 Rue de Lille, Paris).  
 Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, à la Sorbonne, Paris.  
 Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, Berlin.  
 Deutsche Literaturzeitung, Berlin.  
 Indogermanische Forschungen (K. J. Trübner, Strassburg).  
 Literarisches Centralblatt, Leipsic.  
 Musée Belge (Prof. Waltzing, 9 Rue du Parc, Liège, Belgium).  
 Neue philologische Rundschau, Gotha (F. A. Perthes).  
 Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, Berlin.  
 Rivista di Filologia, Turin (Ermanno Loescher).  
 Bolletino di Filologia Classica, Via Vittorio Amadeo ii, Turin.  
 Biblioteca delle Scuole Italiane (Dr. A. G. Amatucci, Maddalena Maggiore 43,  
 Naples).  
 Zeitschrift für die österr. Gymnasien (Prof. J. Golling, Maximilians-Gymnasium,  
 Vienna).  
 L'Université Catholique (Prof. A. Lepitre, 10 Avenue de Noailles, Lyons).

[Total (589 + 60 + 43 + 1 + 17) = 710.]

CONSTITUTION  
OF THE  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

ARTICLE I. — NAME AND OBJECT.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."
2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II. — OFFICERS.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.
2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.
3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

ARTICLE III. — MEETINGS.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.
2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.
3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.
4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

## ARTICLE IV. — MEMBERS.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.

2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

## ARTICLE V. — SUNDRIES.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

## ARTICLE VI. — AMENDMENTS.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

# AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

(ORGANIZED 1869).

---

## PRESIDENT.

1869-1870	. . . .	William D. Whitney.
1870-1871	. . . .	Howard Crosby.
1871-1872	. . . .	William W. Goodwin.
1872-1873	. . . .	Asahel C. Kendrick.
1873-1874	. . . .	Francis A. March.
1874-1875	. . . .	J. Hammond Trumbull.
1875-1876	. . . .	Albert Harkness.
1876-1877	. . . .	S. S. Haldeman.
1877-1878	. . . .	B. L. Gildersleeve.
1878-1879	. . . .	Jotham B. Sewall.
1879-1880	. . . .	Crawford H. Toy.
1880-1881	. . . .	Lewis R. Packard.
1881-1882	. . . .	Frederic D. Allen.
1882-1883	. . . .	Milton W. Humphreys.
1883-1884	. . . .	Martin Luther D'Ooge.
1884-1885	. . . .	William W. Goodwin.
1885-1886	. . . .	Tracy Peck.
1886-1887	. . . .	Augustus C. Merriam.
1887-1888	. . . .	Isaac H. Hall.
1888-1889	. . . .	Thomas D. Seymour.
1889-1890	. . . .	Charles R. Lanman.
1890-1891	. . . .	Julius Sachs.
1891-1892	. . . .	Samuel Hart.
1892-1893	. . . .	William Gardner Hale.
1893-1894	. . . .	James M. Garnett.
1894-1895	. . . .	John Henry Wright.
1895-1896	. . . .	Francis A. March.
1896-1897	. . . .	Bernadotte Perrin.
1897-1898	. . . .	Minton Warren.
1898-1899	. . . .	Clement L. Smith.
1899-1900	. . . .	Abby Leach.

1900-1901	. . . .	Samuel Ball Platner.
1901-1902	. . . .	Andrew F. West.
1902-1903	. . . .	Charles Forster Smith.
1903-1904	. . . .	George Hempl.
1904-1905	. . . .	Herbert Weir Smyth.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.<sup>1</sup>

1869-1873	. . . .	George F. Comfort.
1873-1878	. . . .	Samuel Hart.
1878-1879	. . . .	Thomas C. Murray.
1879-1884	. . . .	Charles R. Lanman.
1884-1889	. . . .	John Henry Wright.
1889-1904	. . . .	Herbert Weir Smyth.
1904-1905	. . . .	Frank Gardner Moore.

## TREASURER.

1869-1873	. . . .	J. Hammond Trumbull.
1873-1875	. . . .	Albert Harkness.
1875-1883	. . . .	Charles J. Buckingham.
1883-1884	. . . .	Edward S. Sheldon.
1884-1889	. . . .	John Henry Wright.
1889-1904	. . . .	Herbert Weir Smyth.
1904-1905	. . . .	Frank Gardner Moore.

<sup>1</sup> The offices of *Secretary* and *Treasurer* were united in 1884; and in 1891-1892 the title *Curator* was allowed to lapse.



## PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

---

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

For the contents of Volumes I-XXX inclusive, see Volume XXXIV, pp. cxliii ff.

The contents of the last five volumes are as follows :—

### 1900. — Volume XXXI.

Rolfe, J. C. : The formation of substantives from Latin geographical adjectives by ellipsis.

Bonner, Campbell : The Danaid-myth.

Fowler, H. N. : Pliny, Pausanias, and the *Hermes* of Praxiteles.

Showerman, Grant : Was Attis at Rome under the Republic ?

Carter, J. B. : The cognomina of the goddess Fortuna.

Smith, C. F. : Traces of epic usage in Thucydides.

Seymour, T. D. : Notes on Homeric war.

Gudeman, A. : The sources of the *Germania* of Tacitus.

Capps, E. : Studies in Greek agonistic inscriptions.

Hale, W. G. : Is there still a Latin potential ?

Heidel, W. A. : On Plato's *Euthyphro*.

Hempl, G. : The Salian hymn to Janus.

Chase, G. D. : Sun myths in Lithuanian folksongs.

Wilson, H. L. : The use of the simple for the compound verb in Juvenal.

Bennett, C. E. : The stipulative subjunctive in Latin.

Proceedings of the thirty-second annual session, Madison, 1900.

### 1901. — Volume XXXII.

Wheeler, B. I. : The causes of uniformity in phonetic change.

Clapp, E. B. : Pindar's accusative constructions.

- Merrill, E. T.: Some observations on the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum.  
 Harry, J. E.: A misunderstood passage in Aeschylus (*Prom.* 119).  
 Franklin, S. B.: Public appropriations for individual offerings and sacrifices in Greece.  
 Morgan, M. H.: Rain-gods and rain-charms.  
 Warren, M.: Some ancient and modern etymologies.  
 Adams, C. D.: The Harpalos case.  
 Steele, R. B.: Anaphora and chiasmus in Livy.  
 Hempl, G.: The variant runes on the Franks casket.  
 Bill, C. P.: Notes on the Greek *Θεωρός* and *Θεωρία*.  
 Elmer, H. C.: On the subjunctive with *Forsitan*.  
 Proceedings of the special session, Philadelphia, 1900.  
 Proceedings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1900.  
 Proceedings of the thirty-third annual session, Cambridge, 1901.

### 1902. — Volume XXXIII.

- Earle, M. L.: Studies in Sophocles's *Trachinians*.  
 Morgan, M. H.: Remarks on the water supply of ancient Rome.  
 Richardson, L. J.: On certain sound properties of the Sapphic strophe as employed by Horace.  
 Shipley, F. W.: Numeral corruptions in a ninth century Ms. of Livy.  
 Steele, R. B.: Some forms of complementary sentences in Livy.  
 Prentice, W. K.: Fragments of an early Christian liturgy in Syrian inscriptions.  
 Allen, J. T.: On the so-called iterative optative in Greek.  
 Wheeler, B. I.: Herodotus's account of the battle of Salamis.  
 Perrin, P.: The Nikias of Pasiphon and Plutarch.  
 Hempl, G.: The Duenos inscription.  
 Proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual session, Schenectady, 1902.  
 Proceedings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1901.

### 1903. — Volume XXXIV.

- Moore, F. G.: Studies in Tacitean Ellipsis: descriptive passages.  
 Goodell, T. D.: Word-accent in Catullus's galliambics.  
 Brownson, C. L.: The succession of Spartan nauarchs in *Hellenica* I.  
 Prescott, H. W.: Magister curiae in Plautus's *Aulularia* 107.  
 Miller, C. W. E.: Hephaestion and the anapaest in the Aristophanic trimeter.  
 Radford, R. S.: The Latin monosyllables in their relation to accent and quantity.  
     A study in the verse of Terence.  
 March, F. A.: Three new types.  
 Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual meeting, New Haven, 1903.  
 Proceedings of the fourth annual meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1902.

1904. — Volume XXXV.

- Ferguson, W. S. : Historical value of the twelfth chapter of Plutarch's Life of Pericles.  
 Botsford, G. W. : On the distinction between *Comitia* and *Concilium*.  
 Radford, R. S. : Studies in Latin accent and metric.  
 Johnson, C. W. L. : The *Accentus* of the ancient Latin grammarians.  
 Bolling, G. M. : The *Çāntikalpa* of the Atharva-Veda.  
 Rand, E. K. : Notes on Ovid.  
 Goebel, J. : The etymology of Mephistopheles.  
 Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual meeting, St. Louis, 1904.  
 Proceedings of the fifth and sixth annual meetings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, 1903, 1904.

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application to the Secretary or to the Publishers until they are out of print.

Fifty separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions, ten of articles printed in the Proceedings, are given to the authors for distribution. Additional copies will be furnished at cost.

The "Transactions *for*" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state—not the year of publication, but rather—the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table :—

The Transactions for 1869 and

	1870	form	Vol. I.
The Trans. for	1871	"	" II.
" "	1872	"	" III.
" "	1873	"	" IV.
" "	1874	"	" V.
" "	1875	"	" VI.
" "	1876	"	" VII.
" "	1877	"	" VIII.
" "	1878	"	" IX.
" "	1879	"	" X.
" "	1880	"	" XI.
" "	1881	"	" XII.
" "	1882	"	" XIII.
" "	1883	"	" XIV.
" "	1884	"	" XV.
" "	1885	"	" XVI.
" "	1886	"	" XVII.

The Trans. for 1887 form Vol. XVIII.

"	"	1888	"	"	XIX.
"	"	1889	"	"	XX.
"	"	1890	"	"	XXI.
"	"	1891	"	"	XXII.
"	"	1892	"	"	XXIII.
"	"	1893	"	"	XXIV.
"	"	1894	"	"	XXV.
"	"	1895	"	"	XXVI.
"	"	1896	"	"	XXVII.
"	"	1897	"	"	XXVIII.
"	"	1898	"	"	XXIX.
"	"	1899	"	"	XXX.
"	"	1900	"	"	XXXI.
"	"	1901	"	"	XXXII.
"	"	1902	"	"	XXXIII.
"	"	1903	"	"	XXXIV.
"	"	1904	"	"	XXXV.

The price of these volumes is \$2.00 apiece, except Volumes XV., XX., XXIII., and XXXII., for which \$2.50 is charged. The first two volumes will not be sold separately. A charge of fifty cents each is made for the Index of Authors and Index of Subjects to Vols. I.-XX. and to Vols. XXI.-XXX.

#### BINDING.

Back volumes will be bound in the style of this volume for thirty-five cents each by F. J. Barnard & Co., 17 Province St., Boston, Mass., provided at least twelve volumes are sent at a time, and the cost of transportation both ways is paid by the owner. All parcels should be plainly marked with the name and address of the sender, and the binders should be notified at the time the unbound volumes are sent in order that the sender may be identified.

Libraries may obtain bound copies of the annual volumes at twenty-five cents per volume in addition to the regular price.

#### REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions and Proceedings will be sold, until further notice, at a reduction of 20%.

It is especially appropriate that American Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of American scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible; and, apart from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.